

ANCIENT BRITAIN REVISITED

by
ALEX, DEL MAR

ANCIENT BRITAIN

LIST OF MR. DEL MAR'S WRITINGS.

- I. *Gold Money and Paper Money*—New York, A. D. F. Randolph, 1862. Pamphlet.
- II. *History and Principles of Taxation*—New York *Social Science Review*, 1865.
- III. *Essays in Political Economy*—New York *Social Science Review*, 1866.
- IV. *Statistics of the World*—Washington, Government Press, 1866. Pamphlet.
- V. *What is Free Trade?*—New York; G. P. Putnam and Son, 1867. 12mo. 150 pp.
- VI. *Decadence of American Shipbuilding*—Washington, Government Press, 1867. Pamphlet.
- VII. *The Whiskey Tax for 100 Years*—Published by Congressional Sub-Committee on Retrenchment, 1868.
- VIII. *Monthly Statistical Reports on the Commerce, Navigation, Trade, Resources, &c., of the Various Countries of the World*, from November, 1866, to January, 1869. Washington, Government Press. 26 vols. Quarto pamphlets.
- IX. *Annual Reports on the Commerce and Navigation of the United States of America*, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868. Washington, Government Press. 4 vols. 8vo. 700 to 800 pp. each.
- X. *Operation of the Tariff Laws*—Familiarly known as the *Suppressed Report*. Washington, Government Press, 1868; Reprint, 1879.
- XI. *Letter on the Finances*—New York; Douglass Taylor, 1868. Pamphlet.
- XII. *Seven Essays on the Treasury*—New York; Citizen office, 1869. Pamphlets.
- XIII. *Finances of the United States*—Columbus, Ohio, *Statesman* office, 1870. Pamphlet.
- XIV. *Life Insurance for Women*—New York; Underwriter office, 1871.
- XV. *History of the Rate of Interest*—New York; Proceedings of the National Insurance Convention, 1872. Pamphlet.
- XVI. *Progress of Life Insurance*—St. Petersburg; Imperial Press, 1872.
- XVII. *A Summer Tour in High Latitudes, or Travels in Scandinavia, Finland, and Russia*—New York; Appleton's *Journal*, 1873.
- XVIII. *Recollections of the Civil Service*—New York; Appleton's *Journal*, 1874.
- XIX. *Agriculture of the World, by Countries*—Chicago *Times and Inter-Ocean*, 1874.
- XX. *Resources of Egypt*—Philadelphia; McCalla and Staveley, 1874. Pamphlet.
- XXI. *Resources of Spain*—Philadelphia; McCalla and Staveley, 1875. Pamphlet.
- XXII. *Agriculture of Prussia*—New York; Wm. Barnes and Co., 1875. Pamphlet.
- XXIII. *Productive Forces of Bavaria*—New York; Wm. Barnes and Co., 1875. Pamphlet.
- XXIV. *Famishing Portugal*—Philadelphia; Lippincott's *Magazine*, 1876. Pamphlet.
- XXV. *Production of Silver in the United States*—Washington, Government Press, 1876.
- XXVI. *First List of all the Merchant Vessels of the United States of America*, with name, rig, tonnage, hailing port, and signal number of each one. Washington, Government Press, 1866 8vo., 300 pp.

XXVII. *Report on the Mines of the Comstock Lode*—Washington, Government Press, 1876.

XXVIII. *Essays on the World's Production of Gold and Silver; Relative Value of Gold and Silver; Population and Money; Demonetization of Silver in Germany; The French War Indemnity; Movement of Silver to India; Metallic Standard of Money in the United States; Coinage of the United States; Metallic Standard of Money in the United Kingdom; Monetary System of Austria-Hungary, and Monetary System of China*—Printed in the Report of the U. S. Monetary Commission; Washington; Government Press, 1877.

XXIX. *Real History of the Big Bonanza Mines*—San Francisco; Argonaut print, 1878.

XXX. *Bill to Regulate Mining Companies*—Argument in California Senate Committee—Sacramento, 1878. Pamphlet.

XXXI. *Insanity and Crime in Mining Countries*—San Francisco; Mining and Scientific Press, 1878.

XXXII. *Usury and the Jews*—San Francisco; I. N. Choynski, 1879. Pamphlet.

XXXIII. *Theory of Value*—San Francisco; Mining and Scientific Press, 1879.

XXXIV. *The Principles of Insurance*—Argument in California Senate Committee on Corporations—San Francisco; Bosqui and Co., 1880. Pamphlet.

XXXV. *History of Money in China*—San Francisco; J. R. Brodie and Co., 1880. Pamphlet.

XXXVI. *History of the Precious Metals*—from the Earliest Times to the Present. London; Geo. Bell and Sons, 1880. 8vo., 373 pp.

XXXVII. *Impeachment of the Treasury*—New York *Sun*, October, 1880.

XXXVIII. *The Gold Drain and Impending Panic*—New York *Sun*, March 15th, 1884.

XXXIX. *Rape of the Earth*—or Travels and Researches in the principal Mining Districts of North and South America, Europe, and Africa. In Press.

XL. *Essay on Corporations*—San Francisco; Printed by the Mechanics' Institute, 1884. Pamphlet.

XLI. *History of Money in Ancient Countries*—from the Earliest Times to the Present. London; Geo. Bell and Sons, 1885. 8vo., 400 pp.

XLII. *The Science of Money*. London; Geo. Bell and Sons. 8vo., 124 pp.

XLIII. *The Politics of Money*.

XLIV. *The Worship of Augustus Caesar*—Derived from a study of coins, monuments, calendars, aeras and astrological cycles, the whole establishing a New Chronology of History and Religion.

XLV. *The Middle Ages Revisited* or the Roman Government and Religion from Augustus to the Fall of Constantinople.

XLVI. *Ancient Britain* in the light of modern archaeological discoveries.

XLVII. *History of Money in America*—From the Discovery, to the Foundation of the American Constitution.

XLVIII. *Barbara Villiers*—A History of Monetary Crimes.

XLIX. *The Beneficent Effects of Silver Money* during the 17th Century.

L. *Money and Civilization*, 1885.

LI. *Roman and Moslem Monies*.

LII. *History of Money in the Netherlands*.

GEORGE E. MAYCOCK

ANCIENT BRITAIN

IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN

ARCHÆOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES

BY

ALEX. DEL MAR

FORMERLY DIRECTOR OF THE U. S. BUREAU OF STATISTICS, AUTHOR OF
"A HISTORY OF THE PRECIOUS METALS," "A HISTORY OF MONE-
TARY SYSTEMS," "THE MIDDLE AGES REVISITED," "THE
WORSHIP OF AUGUSTUS CÆSAR," ETC., ETC.



The Christian Book Club
Of America

HAWTHORNE, CALIFORNIA 90250

(All rights reserved)

1973

First Published 1899

636 - I'

B-Israel — PAC


ANCIENT BRITAIN

CHAPTERS.

	PAGE.
PREFACE,	ix
BIBLIOGRAPHY,	xi
I.—ANCIENT BRITAIN,	I
II.—THE ROMAN CONQUEST OF BRITAIN,	15
III.—LANGUAGE, LAWS, GOVERNMENT, RELIGION,	26
IV.—FROM AGRICOLA TO THE SACK OF LONDON,	34
V.—THE LAST CENTURY OF PAGAN IMPERIAL RULE,	47
VI.—THE REVOLT UNDER MAXIMUS, 383-'9,	54
VII.—THE REPUTED INVASION BY HENGIST AND Horsa,	64
VIII.—MONUMENTS OF ROMAN CIVILIZATION,	75
IX.—THE ROMAN HOUSE OF COMMONS,	89
X.—TRIAL BY JURY,	108
XI.—THE WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS,	113
XII.—THE PREROGATIVE OF MONEY,	116
XIII.—RISE OF THE GOTHIC POWER ON THE CONTINENT,	126
XIV.—THE GOTHIC PROVINCE OF SAXONY,	135
XV.—DESTRUCTION OF THE GOTHIC POWER,	145
XVI.—GOTHIC LANGUAGE, GOVERNMENT, RELIGION,	154
XVII.—GOTHIC REMAINS FOUND IN ENGLAND,	166
XVIII.—PRETENDED BRETWEALDAS OF THE HEPTARCHY,	175
XIX.—THE NORMAN CONQUEST,	182
XX.—CONCLUSION,	189

APPENDICES.

A—ORIGIN OF THE BRITISH TRIBES,	193
B—THE CODEX ARGENTEUS,	195
C—ROMAN WALLS IN BRITAIN,	199
INDEX,	201
CORRIGENDA,	206



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

ANCIENT BRITAIN

IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN DISCOVERIES

PREFACE.

It has been shown by writers of the highest credit, among whom are Sir Francis Palgrave and Thomas Wright the antiquarian, that the monkish chronicles which relate that Britain was occupied by Anglo-Saxons in the fifth century, are forged or corrupted, some of them centuries later than the æras of their pretended authors. These spurious works were issued by or under the express authority of the same college which issued the forged Letter of St. Peter, the forged Donation of Constantine, the forged capitularies of Adrian and numerous other impostures. Albeit the true character of the false Saxon chronicles have been frequently exposed, they still continue to colour our popular histories and to injuriously affect our national policy. The archæological discoveries and especially the numismatic finds which have come to light in late years, not only corroborate the conclusions of Palgrave and Wright, they impress upon us so ample a body of testimony against the false witnesses of Rome that, inert and indifferent as we have hitherto been in the matter, we are now compelled to choose between them; and upon that choice must depend the disposition of several important subjects of practical administration.

As with the period of the barbarian occupation, so with the circumstances of the Roman conquest, the early records of Britain have been largely falsified or perverted. Many of our institutes of freedom, such as the right of assemblage, of trial by jury, of immunity from unlawful detention, of representation in the Comitia and the subjection of the ecclesiastical to the civil power, which are clearly derived from the early Roman republic, together with others of an entirely differ-

ent sort, like the privileges and benefices of the priesthood, the feudal system and the institution of caste, which clearly sprang from the later Roman hierarchy, have, with careless inconsistency, been ascribed to the barbarians. It may be safely assumed that the tree which bore such diverse fruits sprang up in a cloister; for it will nowhere be found in the domain of nature. The worship of the Living Emperor, which was the corner-stone of the Roman hierarchy and was enforced in Britain for several centuries, giving rise at the very outset to the Revolt of Boadicea and remaining unshaken until it was overthrown by the Goths; this too has been falsified or suppressed. The presence of Moslem influence in Britain—a fact unmistakably indicated by the gold dinars of Offa, the common use of Arabian marks, mancusses, carats, and sterlings, and many other circumstances—all this has been omitted from our histories and its place filled with fables stolen from the idolatrous mythologies of the Orient, or manufactured in the hotbeds of medieval imposture.

Among the numerous products of hierarchical ingenuity none have more effectually fouled the stream of British history than the invention of a line of Bretwealdas, or over-lords, who it is pretended, united the distracted chieftains of the Heptarchy and governed them in the name of Rome. This conceit, touching and warming a false national pride, has found belief, when it should only have excited contempt. It has slandered, belittled, and in some cases entirely removed from history, many of our brave Norse ancestors, those, who, whether pagans or christians, stamped upon our race the qualities and aptitudes for which we have the most reason to be proud, and filled their places with a succession of “kings” without royal powers, of heroes whose only virtue was subserviency to Rome, and of saints who never existed at all.

The design of the present work is to restore to the pages of British history those circumstances of which forgery and imposture have deprived it and which archæology has found safely preserved in the pure bosom of the earth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following list of books is to be read in connection with the lists published in the author's previous works. The numbers at the end of each title are the press marks of the British Museum library.

- ABBAY (Richard). Restoration of the Ancient System of Tank Irrigation in Ceylon. Printed in the London "Nature" of Oct. 11, 1877.
- ABU MASHAR (*See* ALBUMAZAR).
- ACHERY (Luke D'). Spicilegium; sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Gallie bibliothesis delituerant. Paris, 1723, 3 tom. fol. 10. e. 1-3,
- ADAM OF BREMEN. Historia Ecclesiastica ejusdem auctaris libellus de situ Daniae, 1706, fol. 158. h. 14.
- ADAMS (Alexander), *Rev.* Roman Antiquities, 18th ed., Edinburgh, 1854, 8vo.
- (This popular work was originally published in 1791, and has passed through numerous editions, both in England and America. It omits or conceals much more than it discloses concerning the religious belief and ceremonies of the Romans, and must therefore be consulted with discretion.)
- ALBIRUNI (Mohammad Ibn Ahmad). Chronology of Ancient Nations. Trans. by C. E. Sachau. London, 1879, 8vo. 752. l. 24.
- Institutes and Customs of India in the eleventh century. Trans. by C. E. Sachau. London, 1888, 2 vols. 2318. h. 4.
- ALBUMAZAR (Jafar Ibn Muhammad, commonly known as Albumazar, Albumasar, or Albumashar). Flores Astrologie. Trans. from the Arabic by J. B. Sessa, Venice, 1485, 4to. 718. f. 2. (2.)
- ALISON (Archibald), *Rev.* "Essays," political, historical and miscellaneous. London, 1850, 3 vols, 8vo.
- ALLEN (John), *Master of Dulwich College.* Inquiry into the Growth of the Royal Prerogative in England. London, 1849, 8vo. 2238. e. 1.
- (A short performance, whose reputation exceeds its merit. It holds that "homage" is a custom derived from the ancient Germans; that modern sovereigns add to their titles, "by the grace of God," because the Saxon hlaford was sacred to the churl; and that the king, instead of the Augustus, is the Fountain of Honour. The author has advanced no evidences to support these assertions.)
- ALLMER (A). Les Gestes du Dieu Auguste d' apres l' inscription du Temple d' An-cyre. Vienne, 1889, 8vo. 7705. ee. (17.)
- ALVIELLA (*See* GOBLET.)
- AMERICA. Recopilacion de Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias. Madrid, 3d edicion, 1774, 4 tomos, fol.
- ANTHROPOLOGY. Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay. Vol. II, pp. 164-224. Fawcett on "Festivals to Village Goddesss." London, 1886, 8vo. Ac. 6242.
- ARATUS (of Soli). The Phænomena and Diosemeia, trans. by J. Lamb. London, 1848, 8vo. There is another trans. by J. H. Voss. 1348. c. 9.
- ARISTOTLE. Works. Trans. by T. Taylor, London, 1812, 9 vols., 4to. 2052. h.
- ARRIAN (Flavius). The Anabasis of Alexander; literally trans. by E. J. Chinnock, London, 1884, 8vo. 9026. ff. 18.
- Voyage round the Euxine sea. Tr. W. Falconer, Oxford, 1805, 4to. 200. e. 18.
- Voyage of Nearchus and Periplus of the Erythræan sea. Gr. with Eng. Trans. by W. Vincent, Oxford, 1809, 4to. 570. g. 16.
- ASHLEY (W. J.) Essay on Feudalism. London, 1887, 8vo.
- ATWOOD (William). Barrister at Law and Chief Justice of New York. Fundamental Constitution of the English Government. London, 1690, fol.
- AURELIUS VICTOR (Sextus). De origine gentis Romanæ, 1826, 8vo. Origine du Peuple Romaine, a French translation of the same work, by N. A. Dubois. 11,306. K. 9.

AYLIFFE (J.) *Rev.* A new Pandect of Roman Civil Law. Vol. I. (The only volume published). 1734, fol. 500. g. 14.

BAILLY (Jean Sylvain). Histoire de l'Astronomie ancienne depuis son origine jusqu'à l'établissement de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie, 2nd ed., Paris, 1781, 4to. 8562. e. 14.

——— Traite de l'Astronomie Indienne et Orientale. Paris, 1787, 4to, 59. h. 5.

——— Ancient History of Asia; a series of letters to Voltaire. London, 1814, 8vo. 1137. b. 21, 22.

BALUZE (Etienne). Histoire des capitulaires des Rois François de la premiere et seconde race. Paris, 1779, 8vo. 708. a. 12.

BANQUERI (Josef Antonio). Libro de Agricultura, traduccion de Abn Lakariya. Madrid, 1802, 2 vols, fol. 441. I. 2. 3.

BAUER (Bruno). Christus und der Cæsaren, Berlin, 1879, 8vo. 4534. cc. (7.)

BEAL (Samuel) *Rev.* Buddhist Travels in the West. London, 1890, 2 vols, 8vo.

BEAUSOBRE (Isaac de). Histoire Critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme. Amsterdam, 1734-9, 2 vols, 4to. 678. e. 11-12.

BECK (Ludwig). Die Geschichte der Eisens. Brunswick, 1884, 8vo. 7104. d.

BEDE. Ecclesiastical History of England and Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Trans. by J. A. Giles, London, 1847, 8vo.

BELL. Historical Studies of Feudalism, 1852.

BELON (Peter). Travels. Trans. by J. Ray, 1693, 8vo. 978. g. (1.)

BELOT (E.) De la revolution economique à Rome au millieu du IIIe siecle, A. C. Paris, 1885, 8vo. 8226. eee. (24.)

BENJAMIN OF TUDELA. Itinerary; Heb. with Eng. Trans. by A. Asher. London, 1840-1, 12mo. 1938. c. 11.

BENTLEY (John). Hist. Rev. of the Hindu Astronomy. London, 1825, 8vo. 531. i. (21.)

BERNARD (Jacques). Recueil de Traitez de Paix de Treve, etc., de A. D. 536, jusqu'à A. D. 1700. Amsterdam, 1700, fol. 589, i, 8.

BEUDOIN. Etude sur les origines du regime feudal. Grenoble, 1889, 8vo. 6005. f. 4, (1.)

BEZOLD (Carl). Oriental Diplomacy. London, 1893, 8vo. 7704. aaa. 54.

BHAGAVAT-GITA; known also as Christna's Gospel, the Divine Song, Christna's Revelation, etc. Trans. from Sanscrit into English, by Sir Charles Wilkins. London, 1785, 4to. 14060. f. 1.

BIRCH (Samuel), (formerly of the British Museum.) Records of the Past; being English translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments. London, 8vo, Old Series, in 12 vols., 1873-81; New Series, in 4 vols., 1880-92. 2258. a. 3.

This work is published anonymously. The late Dr. Birch's name is attached to it in the catalogue of the Museum Library, but does not appear in the title page of the work. On the other hand, the name which does appear there is that of the editor, not the author. It is printed under the sanction of the Society of Biblical Archæology.

BLACK (W. H.) The Calendar of Palestine reconciled with the Law of Moses, against the theory of Michaelis. London, 1865, 8vo. 4372. g. 18 (9.)

BLANCHET (J. Adrien). Nouveau manuel de numismatique du Moyen Âge et moderne. With Atlas. 1890, 2 tom, 8vo. 12208. b.

BLAVATSKY (Helena Petrôvna). Isis Unveiled. New York, 1877, 2 vols, 8vo. 2212. c.

BOECKH (Augustus). Corpus Inscriptionum Græcorum, Berlin, 1828, 4 vols, fol. Catalogue Desk. K.

BOISSIER (Gaston). La religion Romaine d'Auguste aux Antonines. Paris, 1874, 8vo. 2212. g.

BONWICK (James). Egyptian Belief and Modern Thought. London, 1878, 8vo, 2212. b.

BOUCHÉ LÉCLERC (A.) Les Pontifes de l'ancienne Rome; etude historique sur les institutions religieuses de Rome. Paris, 1874, 8vo., pp. 435. 4506. d. (1.)

BOULAINVILLIERS (Count Henri de). Histoire de l'ancien gouvernement de France, Amsterdam, 1727, 12mo. 897. a. 14.

——— History of the ancient Parliaments of France. Translated from the French by C. Forman, London, 1754, 2 vol., 8vo. 5424. c.

——— The Life of Mahomet. Trans. into Eng. London, 1752, 12mo. 1857. a.

——— Etat de la France. London, 1727, 2 vols, 8vo. 4855. bb.

BOWER (Archibald). History of the Popes. Dublin, 1749-68, 3 vols, 8vo. 4855. e.

——— Another ed. Phila., 1844-5, 3 vols, 8vo. 11,900. bb. 54.

BOWKER and ILES (R. R. and Geo.) Reader's Guide in Economic, Social and Political Science. New York, 1891, 8vo.

- BRADY (John). *Clavis Calendaria*, or a compendious analysis of the Calendar. London, 1815, 2 vols, 8vo. 11,099. b. 1.
- BRAMSEN (W.) *Japanese Chronological Tables*. Tokio, 1880, 8vo. 630. a. (25.)
- BRANTOME (Pierre de Bourdeilles). *Seigneur de Brantome*. Memoirs. Leyde, 1722, 12mo. 8415. df. (2.)
- Another ed. Paris, 1876, 12mo. 602. e. 19. (2.)
- BREREWOOD (Edward), *Rev.* De Ponderibus et pretiis veterum nummorum, etc. (Edited by R. B.) 1614, 4to. 2258. f.
- BRITANNICA. *Monumenta Historica*. (Passages in classical authors relating to Britain.)
- BROWN (Alex.) *F. R. H. S.* The Genesis of the United States . . . movement in England 1605-16, which resulted in the plantation of North America, etc. London, 1890, 2 vols, 8vo. 9602. i. (1.)
- BRUCE (J. Collingwood), *Rev.* The Roman Wall; a description of the Mural Barrier of the North of England. London, 1867, 4to. (Chiefly a description of Severus', properly Hadrian's Wall and the antiquities found in the vicinity.) 2258. f.
- BRUCE (Philip Alex.) *Economic History of Virginia in the 17th Century*. London, 1896, 2 vols, 8vo. 9605. c. (22.)
- BRUGSCH (Heinrich), *History of Egypt*. Trans. by Philip Smith. London, 1881, 2 vols, 8vo. 2069. a.
- BRUNNEMANNUS. (*See* Justinian.)
- DRYANT (Jacob). *Ancient Mythology*. 3d ed. London, 1807, 6 vols, 8vo. 86. f. 11-16.
- This work is an elaborate effort to reconcile all the myths, in which effort it fails; not, however, without incidentally furnishing a large fund of valuable information.
- BRYCE (James). *The Holy Roman Empire*. 4th ed. London, 1873, 8vo.
- BRYDONE (Patrick). *Sicily and Malta*. London, 1776, 2 vols, 8vo. 10,151. d. 21.
- BUCHANAN (George), *The historian*. *See* Macfarlan.
- BUCKMAN and NEWMARCH. *Illustrations of the Remains of Roman Art in Cirencester*, by Prof. Buckman and C. H. Newmarch. London, 1850.
- BURIGNY. (*See* Levesque.)
- BURKE (Luke). "The Principles of Mythonomy", (Laws of Mythology, Systems of Zodiacs, etc.) "Hebrew Chronology", "Egyptian Chronology", "Discovery of America, by the Northmen", etc.; a number of articles on these and kindred topics published in the *London Ethnological* for 1848, 1854, and 1865-6, these being the only years of its publication. 8vo. PP. 3862. a. and 295.
- CALLIMACHUS. *Hymns, Epigrams, etc.* Trans. by Revd. J. Banks. Bound with Hesiod. London, 1856, 8vo. 2500. f.
- CANDOLLE (Alphonse de). *Histoire des Sciences et des savants depuis deux siècles, suivre d'autres études . . . en particulier sur la sélection dans l'espèce humaine*. Geneve, Bâle, Lyon, 1873, 8vo. 8707. ee. (15.)
- CAPELLA (Martianus Mineus Felix). *De Nuptiis Philologiæ et Mercurii*. (On the accord of Bacchus and the Logos). Ed. Kopp, Frankfurt, 7836, 4to. 718. i. (25.)
- CAREW (George), *Sir*. *Pacutu Hibernia, or History of the late wars of Ireland under Sir George Carew and compiled by his direction*. 1663, fol. 186. d. (8.)
- History of Ireland. 601. m. 6.
- Letters to Sir Thomas Roe. Ac. 8113-71.
- CAREW (George), *Earl of Totness*. *Report of the Master of the Rolls upon the Carte and Carew Papers*. 1864, 8vo. 2075. c. i.
- Calendar of the Carew MSS. 1867, 8vo. 2075. c.
- CARLILE (Richard), *The Deist*; containing theological Essays by Baron de Holbach, Voltaire, and others. London, 1819-20, 2 vols, 8vo. 4015. f.
- CARRANZA (Alonso). *El ajustamento y proporcion de las monedas de oro, plata y cobre, y la reducion distros metales, etc.* Madrid, 1629, fol. 504. g. (6.)
- CATON (W.) *Abridg. of the Chronol. of Eusebius*. London, 1661, 12mo. 4530. aa.
- CHARTON (Edouard). *Voyageurs, anciens et modernes*. Paris, 1854, 4 vols, in 2, 8vo. 2060.
- CHRISTNA (Isvara), *The*. Trans. by H. T. Colebrooke, Oxford, 1837, 4to. 752. l. i.
- CHRISTNA. (*See* Christna's Gospel, or the Bhagavat-Gita).
- CHURCHILL (Chas. Henry.) *Mount Lebanon*. London, 1853, 3 vols, 8vo. 10,075. d.
- The Druzes and the Marionites. London, 1862, 8 vo. 10,075. d.
- CLARKE (Edward), *Rev.* *Letters concerning the Spanish Nation (including Coins)*. London, 1763, 4to. 179. d. 18.

- CLARKE (G.). "Pompeii." London, 1831, 2 vols, 12mo. 1157. a. 21-2.
- CODEX ARGENTEUS. Quator D.N. Jesu Christi evangeliorum, versiones per antiquæ duæ Gothica scilicet et Anglo-Saxonica: Quarum illam ex celeberrimo Codice Argenteo nunc primum depromsit, Franciscus Junius F. F. hanc autem ex codicibus MSS. collatis emendatius recudi curavit, Thomas Mareschallus, Anglus, etc. Dordrecht, 1665, 4to. 218. g.
- COLEBROOKE (Henry T.). Miscellaneous Essays, containing "Religious Ceremonies of the Hindus." London, 1873, 3 vols, 8vo. 14085. e. 6-8.
- COLUMELLA (L. J. M.). Husbandry; in XII Books. French trans. by Nisard; Eng. trans. by M. C. Curtius. London, 1745, 4to. 34. d. 1.
- CONSTITUTION and Present State of Great Britain. (See GREAT BRITAIN.)
- COOTE, The Romans in Britain, London, 1878, 8vo. 2394. e.
(A work of merit, the materials being chiefly drawn from the Roman laws relative to land and the archæological remains of Britain.)
- CORSINO (Edoardo). Fasti Attici, in quibus Archontum Atheniensium series, Philosophorum, oriorumque Illustrium Virorum ætas, etc. 4tom. Florentiæ, 1744-56, 4to. 673. h. (4.)
- COULANGES (Numa Denis Fustel de), The Ancient City; a study on the religion, laws, and institutions of Greece and Rome. Trans. by W. Small. Boston, 1874, 8vo. 2259. b. (e.)
- The Origin in Property by Land. Trans. by M. Ashley. London, 1891, 8vo. 08276. e. (9.)
- Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France. Paris, 1891-2, 6 vols. 8vo. 2390. d.
- COUTZEN (Adamus). Politicorum libri decem in quibus de perfectæ reipubl. forma, virtutibus et Vitiis, etc. Moguntia, 1621, fol. C. 24. d.
- The plot of Coutzen the Moguntine Jesuit to cheat a church of the religion established therein and to serve in Popery by Art, etc. London, 1641, 4to. 702. d.8.(2.)
- CREECH (Thomas). The Five Books of Marcus Manilius, containing a system of the Ancient Astronomy and Astrology, together with the Philosophy of the Stoics. Done into English verse, with Notes. London, 1697, 8vo. (See Manlius and Shirburn for other editions of the Five Books called the Astronomicum.) 11385. b. b.
- CREUZER (George Frederich). Religions d' antiquité refondu, etc., par G. D. Guigniaut, L. F. A. Maury, and E. Vinet. Paris, 1825-51, 4 vols. 8vo. 2212. b.
- CYPRIAN, Bishop of Carthage, A. D. 248-58. Unity of the Church, a Sermon. Trans. by Revd. J. Fell, Bishop of Oxford. London, 1681, 4to. 3805. a.
- DAREMBERG ET SAGLIO. Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines. Paris, 1873, 2 vols, 4to. In progress: In 1897 it was completed to "E." Cat., Desk I.
- DE SACY. (See SILVESTRE.)
- DEUBER (F. H. A.). Geschichte der Schifffahrt in atlantischen Ozean, zum Beweis das. . der Compass. . vor F. G. entdeckt worden sey. Bamberg, 8vo. 1424. c.
- DIDRON (Adolphe N.). Christian Iconography, or the History of Christian Art in the Middle Ages. Trans. by E. J. Millington. London, 1849, 2 vols, 8vo. 2502. b.
- DIETRICHSON (L.). Stavkirker; or an illustrated treatise on the church architecture of Norway. Christiania, 1892, 8vo.
- DIODORUS SICULUS. History. Trans. by G. Booth. London, 1600, fol. 2068. g.
- DION CASSIUS. Rerum Romanarum, libri octoginta, ab Immanuel Bekkero. Greek text. Lipsiæ, 1849, 2 vols, 8vo. 2052. e.
- Histoire Romaine. Paris, 1845-70, 10 tom., 8vo. 1307. i. (12-19.)
- An oration . . . to Octavius Cæsar Augustus, against monarchy, taken out of the XIIth book of Dion. London, 1657, 4to. E. 972. (3.)
- The History of D. C. abridged by Xiphilinus. Done from the Greek by Mr. Manning. London, 1704, 2 vols, 8vo. 293. f. (28, 29.)
- DIONYSIUS of Halicarnassus. Antiquities of Rome. Trans. by Spelman. London, 1758, 4 vols. 4to. 196. b. (1-4.)
- DITTENBERGER (William). Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum. Berlin, 1878, fol. 2068. g.
- DRUMMOND (W.). Zodiacs of Esné and Denderah. London, 1821, 8vo. 1140. d. 7.
- DU BOS (Jean Baptiste). Histoire Critique de l'établissement de la monarchie Française. Amsterdam, 1734, 3 vols, 4to. 182. b. 8-10.
- DU CHOUL (Guillaume). Religion de los Antiguos Romanos. Traducion en Castellano, por Baltasar Perez. Leon, 1579, 4to.

DUMONT D'URVILLE. (*See* D'URVILLE.)

DUNCKER (Max). *History of Antiquity*. Trans. from the German by Evelyn Abbott, M.D. LL.D. London, 1879, 6 vols, 8vo.

DUPIN (Andre M. J. J.) *Father*. Manuel du droit public ecclésiastique français. Paris, 1844, 12mo. 5424. aaa. 5.

DUPUIS (Ch. Fr.) *Origine de tout les Cultes*. Paris, 1794, 3 vols, 4to. Plates.

— Another ed. 7 v., 8vo. Plates. Paris, 1795. 483. a. 1-7 & 484. c. 22.

— An abridgment of the same. Paris, 1822, 12mo. 4503. a. 33.

— On the connection of Christianity with Solar worship. London, 1793, 8vo. An abbreviated edition of the above work, 1877, 8vo. 8632. ccc. 4. (4.)

DUREAU DE LA MALLE (A. J. C. A.) *Economie Politique des Romains*. Paris, 1840. 2 vols, 8vo. 7702. bb. (7.)

D'URVILLE (Dumont d'). On the Venus de Milo, contained in an official periodical entitled "Recueil des Lois relatives a la Marine et aux colonies, etc.", edited by M. Bajot. Paris, 1821, 8vo., part II. P.P. 1365.

DURUY (Victor). *Histoire des Romains*. Nouvelle ed. Paris, 1879, 7 vols, 8vo. 9039. e.

— An English translation by Miss Clarke. London, 1883, 6 vols, 8vo. 2382. g.

DUTT (Romesch Chunder). *Barrister of the Middle Temple*. A History of Civilization in Ancient India, based on Sanscrit literature. London, 1890.

DUVERGIER (G. B. Paul). *La Banque Internationale*. Paris, 1865, 8vo. 8227. h. 35. (7.)

DUVERGIES (Jean Baptiste). *Revue Étrangère (et Française) de legislation, etc.* 1834, etc., tom. 7. P. P. 1275.

— De l'effet retroactif des lois. Paris, 1845, 8vo. 5405. d.

DYER (L.) *Studies of the gods in Greece*. London, 1891, 8vo. 4506. bb. 25.

EGGLESTON. *English Antiquities*. London, 1847. (*See* Del Mar's "Money and Civilization," p. 31*n* for reference to this work.)

ELTON. *Origins of English History*, by C. J. Elton. London, 1882, 8vo.

EUNAPIUS. *Vitæ Philosophorum ac Sophistarum*. Græca, et Latine. 1849, 8vo. 2051. h.

— *Lives of Ancient Philosophers*. 1702, 8vo. 275. g. (8.)

FABER (Geo. S.) *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*. London, 1816, 3 vols, 4to. 4504. g. 12.

Though its argument, that all religions sprang from the worship of the earth and moon, may not be convincing, its descriptions of ancient rites and symbols are useful.

FAWCETT (Fr.) (*See* ANTHROPOLOGY.)

FERGUSON (Rob't) *River names of Europe*. 1863, 8vo.

12901. c. 24.

— *The Northmen in Cumberland*. London, 1856.

FIRMICUS (Julius Maternus). *Alleged ara; fourth century*. De Erorre Profanarum Religionum. Printed in the Bibliotheca Patrone at the end of Cyprian. Paris, 1666. The Astronomicorum was printed in 1499, folio, and is bound in the same volume. (Astron. veterus) with the Astronomicum of Marcus Manilius. 715-k.1.

FISHER and SOETBEER (E. W. F. and A. S.) *Greichische und Romanische Seittafeln*. Altona, 1840, 4to. 584. h. (25.)

FISKE (John). *Assistant Librarian Harvard University*. The Discovery of America, with some account of Ancient America and the Spanish Conquest. Boston, 1892. 2 vols, 8vo. 9551. bb. (13.)

FOSBROKE (Thos. Dudley). *British Monachism*. 3d ed. London, 1843, 8vo. 2003. e.

FREEMAN (Edward). *A History of the Saracens*. London, 1876, 8vo.

— *English Constitution*. London, 1873, 8vo.

FREHERI. (*See* GRÆVIUS, tom. xi.)

FREINSHEIM (Johann). Alex. Mag. daobustomis repræsentatus . . . complectitur, alter (J. F.) com. Q. Curtii, libros superstites exhibit. 1640, etc. 8vo. 584. a. (9.)

FRÉRET (Nicolas). *Defense de la Chronologie*. Paris, 1758, 4to. 216. a. 4.

FROISSART (John). *Chronicles*. (*See* 1337 for the title Lieutenant of the Emperor.)

FRONTINUS. (*See* NISARD.)

FROUDE (James Anthony) *Nemesis of Faith*. A second edition. London, 1849, 12mo., is the only one now in British Museum Library. 2206. a.

— *Cæsar; a Sketch*. London, 1879, 8vo. 10,606. f. (3.)

— *Short Studies on Great Subjects*. London, 1878, 4 vols., 8vo. 2342. a.

FULLER (Thomas) *Rev*. *History of the Holy War*. Cambridge, 1639, fol. (Mentions a bank established in Tyre during the Crusades.) 488. g. 2.

FUSTEL (*See* COULANGES).

- GALLÆUS SERVATIUS. *Dissertationes de Sibyllis*. Amst., 1688, 4to. 704. d. 22.
- GARDTHAUSEN (V.). *Augustus und seine Zeit*. Leipzig, 1891, 8vo. 9041. f.
- GARRAULT (François). *Sieur des Gorges*. Les recherches des monnoyes, poix, et maniere de nombrer des premieres et plus renommées nations du monde. . . . Reduictes et rapportées aux monnoyes, poix, et maniere de nombres des François, etc. Paris, 1576, 8vo. 522. b. (4.)
- Recueil des principaux advis donnez ès assemblées . . . en l'abbaye Saint Germain des prez, etc. . . . Paradoxe sur le faict des monnoyes. Paris, 1578, 8vo.
- Des mines d'argent trouvées en France. Paris, 1834, 8vo., (included in M. L. Cimber's "Archives Curieuses.") 805. b. (3.)
- GAUBIL (Antoine). *Chronologie Chinoise*. Paris, 1776, 4to. 146. b. 20.
- *L'Astronomie Chinoise*, Paris, 1729, 4to. 50. d. 10.
- GEIKIE (JOHN C.) *Rev. Life and words of Christ*. London, 1877, 2 vols, 8vo. 4807. eee. 6.
- GERMANY, Empire of. *Entwurf einer Grundbuch Ordnung und Entwurf eines Gesetzes betreffend die Zwangsvoll streckung*, etc. Berlin, 1889, 8vo. 5604. g. 14.
- GERMANY, Empire of. *Laws relating to Bills of Exchange*. 1879, 8vo. 5606. b. 11.
- GINISTY (Paul). "De Paris à cap Nord." Paris, 1892, 4to.
- GNECCHI (Ercole). *Saggio di bibliografia numismatica delle zecchi italiane*. 1889, 8vo.
- GNEIST (Heinrich R. von). *Hist. of the Eng. Parliament*. Tr. by A. H. Keane. London, 1889, 8vo. 2394. f.
- *Hist. Eng. Constitution*. Tr. by P. A. Ashworth. London, 1891, 8vo. 2394. f. (1.)
- GOBLET (Eugene). *La Migration des Symboles*. Paris, 1891, 8vo. 4503. cc. (19.)
- GODEFROY (Jacques). *De Mutationes et Augmento monetæ aureæ*. Helmstadii, 1732.
- *Legum XII*. 1671, 8vo. 877. i. 4.
- GOODWIN (F.) *The XII Tables, (of the Roman Law,)* London, 1886, 8vo. 5205. aa. 17.
- GOULD (Baring). *Rev. Origin and Development of Religious Belief*. N. Y., 8vo., 1863.
- GRÆVIUS (Johannis Georgius). *Theosaurus Antiquitatem Romanarum*, Lug. Batavorum, 1694-9, 12 tom. fol. Tome viii contains several Roman calendars; tome xi contains the numismatic treatises of Freheri and Gronovius. 2068. e.
- GRAZIANI (A.) *Storia della teoria del Valore en Italia*. Milano, 1889, 8vo. 08229. f. (21.)
- GREAT BRITAIN. *Statutes at Large (which see.)*
- GREEK INSCRIPTIONS, Ancient, in the British Museum. Oxford, 2 vols, fol. 1874-93. Edited by *Rev. E. L. Hicks, C. T. Newton, and Gustav Hirschfeld*. 2068. 9. (Including the inscriptions from Ephesus obtained by J. T. Wood in 1863-74.)
- GRESWELL (Edw.) *Fasti Temporis Catholici*. Oxford, 1852, 4 vols, 8vo. 581. e. (22-26.)
- *Origines Kalendariæ Italicæ*. Oxford, 1854, 4 vols, 8vo. 8561. d. (31)
- *Origines Kalendariæ Hellenicæ*. Oxford, 1862, 6 vols, 8vo. 8560. ee. (10.)
- GREUBER (Erwin). *The Roman Law of Damage to Property. (Lex Aquilium, Digest, IX, 2.)* Oxford, 1886, 8vo. 5205. bb. 20.
- GROSS (J. B.) *Rev. The Heathen Religion*. Cambridge, Mass., 1856, 8vo. 4504. b.
- HALE (Matthew). *Sir. The Inrolling and Registering of all conveyances of Land*. 1694, 4to. E. 1973. (4.)
- HALIBURTON (Robert G.) *New Materials for the History of Man*. Halifax, N. S., 1863, 8vo. 4503. bb. (5.)
- HALLAM (Henry). *Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries*. London, 1839, 3 vols, 8vo.
- *Europe during the Middle Ages*. London, 1869, 8vo.
- HAMILTON (Sir William). *Ambassador to Naples*. Discoveries at Pompeii, with Plates, London, 1717, 4to. 662. h. 18.
- HAMPSON (R. T.) *Dates, Charters and Customs, (including Calendars of the Middle Ages.)* London, 1841, 8vo. 2085. b.
- *Origines Patriciæ; or a Deduction of European titles of nobility from their original sources*. London, 1846, 8vo. 1327. g.
- HANNAY (Robert). *History of the Representation of England, and of the jurisdiction of the House of Commons*. London, 1831, 8vo. 809. g. 15.
- HARDUINI (Joannis). *Jesuite. Antirrheticus de Nummis Antiquis Colonarium et Municipiorum*. Parisiis, 1689, 4to. 602. h. 8.
- *An apology for Homer, wherein the true nature and design of the Iliad is explained and a new system of his theo-mythology proposed*. Tr. from the French. London, 1717, 8vo. 11,315. c. 5.
- *Chronologia Veteris Testamenti, and same in French*. Paris, 1677, 4to.

- HARLEZ (C. de) *Le Calendrier Avestique*. Paris, 1882, 8vo. 4503. f. 30. (2.)
- HARNACK (Adolf). *History of Dogma*. Tr. by Neil Buchanan. 1894, 8vo. 3605. k.
- HARRIS (S. F.) *Elements of Roman Law summarized*. 1889, 8vo. 2228. d.
- HELMOLDUS. *Chronica Slavorum*. Lat. and Fr. 1793, 4to. 158. i. 18.
- HELVETIUS (Claude A.) *Treatise on Man*. London, 1810, 2 vols, 8vo.
- HENRY (Robert). *Rev. History of Britain*. London, 2nd ed., 1795, 8vo., 12 vols in 7.
- HERBERT (Henry H.M.) *Earl of Caernarvon*. *Revolutions of the Druids (or Druses) of Lebanon*. London, 1860, 8vo. 10,076. c.
- HERBERT (The Hon. Algernon). "Nimrod;" a Discourse on certain passages of History and Fable. London, 1828-30, 4 vols, 8vo. 800. e. 20-3.
- *Britannia after the Romans*. London, 1836, 4to. 806. g. 3.
- HESIOD. *The Theogony; also Works and Days*. Trans. by *Rev. J. Banks*. (Bound with Callimachus and Theognis). London, 1856, 8vo. 2500. f.
- HIGGINS (Godfrey). *Horæ Sabaticæ*. London, 1826, 8vo., pamph. 480. b. 27.
- An argument that the Jewish Sabbath was unknown to the Patriarchs, was not instituted until the time of Moses and is nowhere enjoined to be observed in the New Testament.
- HIGGINS (Godfrey). *The Celtic Druids*. London, 1829, 4to. 2072. d. RR.
- A work of much learning, besides containing many valuable materials from Faber, Bryant, Vallancey, and other antiquarians, concerning ancient alphabets, mythology and Druidical remains.
- *Anacalypsis; an enquiry into the origin of Languages, Nations and Religion*. London, 1836, 2 vols, 4to. 2072.
- HOARE (R. C.) *Ancient Wiltshire*. London, 1838, 8vo.
- HOLINSHED (Raphael). *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, from the ed. of 1577*. London, 1807, 6 vols, 4to. 194. c. 3-8.
- HOLWELL (William). *Mythological Dictionary*. London, 1793, 8vo. 696. g. 3.
- HOMER, *The Iliad*. I-VIII, Tr. by C. W. Bateman: IX-XXIV, Tr. by R. Mongan. London, 1848, 12mo. *The Odyssey*. Tr. by R. Mongan. London, 1848, 12mo.
- HOOPPELL (R. E). *Vinovium, the Roman City of Binchester*. London, 1879, 8vo.
- HORACE. *Works*. Tr. by Samuel Lee. London, 1873, 8vo. 2282. a.
- HORSLEY (John). *Britannia Romana, or the Roman Antiquities of Britain*. London, 1732, fol. A valuable antiquarian work; comprehensive and concise. 806. l. 1.
- HOWELL (R). *Rev. History of the World*. (For Dignities of Rome, See II, 24-77.)
- HUEFFER (Francis). *Life of the Greeks and Romans*. Tr. from the German by F. H. etc. London, 1875, 8vo. 2031. a.
- Another Tr. by Ernst Guhl and W. Koner. (Not in the British Museum.)
- HUMBERT (G.) *Les finances chez les Romains*. Paris, 1886, 2 tom, 8vo. 8228. h. (28.)
- HUMBOLDT (F. H. A. Von) *Baron*. *Researches concerning the Institutions and Monuments of the Ancient Inhabitants of America: with description and plates of scenes in the Cordilleras*. The "Vues des Cordilleras," Trans. by Helen M. Williams. London, 1814, 2 vols, 8vo. 1050. k. 13.
- *Fluctuations of Gold*. (Berlin, 1838.) New York, 1900, 8vo. Cambridge Encyclopedia Publishing Company.
- HYDE (Th.) *Rev. Historia Religionis Veterum Persarum*. Oxonii, 1700, 4to. 703. d. 4.
- IBN BATUTA. *Travels into Asia*. Tr. by Rev. Sam'l Lee. London, 1829, 4to. 752. i. 1.
- INDIAN ANTIQUARY (The). Bombay, 1872, 4to. (In Progress.) 14096. e.
- INGRAM (J.) *Rev. The Saxon Chronicle, with Eng. Tr.* London, 1823, 4to. 2070.
- ISHTAR AND IZDUBAR. *The Epic of Babylon, etc.* 1884, 8vo. 11652. k. (12.)
- ISVARA CHRISTNA. (See CHRISHNA.)
- JAMIESON (John, of Edinburgh). *Rev. Hermes Scythicus, or the radical affinities of the Greek and Latin Languages to the Gothic, illustrated from the Mæso-Gothic, Anglo-Saxon and Frankish; and a Dissertation on the historical proofs of the Scythian origin of the Greeks*. Edinburgh, 1814, 8vo. 71. a. 20.
- JASTROW (Ignaz). *Handbuch zu Literaturberichten im Anschluss an die Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft*. 11899. f. 47.
- JOHN I., *Bishop of Antioch*. *Epistolæ*. Greek and Latin. In J. P. Migné's *Patrologiæ*. Series Græcæ, 1857, tom. 77, 4to. 2011. d.
- JORNANDES. *De Gothorum Origine*. Lat. and Fr., the latter by F. Fournier de Monjan, included in the "Collection des Auteurs Latins." Paris, 1850, 8vo. See NISARD.
- JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES. Academies, London, vol. III. 2056. c.
- JUAN DE PERSIA. *Relaciones*. Berlin, 1854, 8vo, broch. 9455. d

- JULIANUS (Flavius Claudius.) *Emperor*. Select works of the Emperor Julian. Tr. by J. Duncan. London, 1784, 2 vols, 8vo. 89. i. 22-23.
- Two Orations of the Emperor Julian, one to the Sovereign Sun, the other to the Mother of the Gods. Tr. by T. Taylor. London, 1793, 8vo. 11391. g. 1.
- Arguments against Christianity. Tr. from the fragments preserved by Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, by T. Taylor. Privately printed; only 25 copies; most of which were destroyed. London, 1809, 8vo. 3670. b.
- JUSTINIAN. Codex (Text) XII libros, ed. J. Brunnemanus. 1679, fol. 5207. h. 5.
- Institutes. (Text.) Latin and English. Cambridge, 1876, 8vo.
- Digest. (Text.) Latin, with Spanish. Tr. by B. A. Rodriguez de Fonseca. Madrid, 1872-5, 3 vols, 4to. 5207. h. 3.
- Digest. Introduction to the study of the, with a full commentary on the title De Usufructo, by Henry John Roby. Cambridge, 1884, 8vo. 2228. cc. 6.
- Digest. (Commentary.) Private Law among the Romans. By John G. Phillimore, Q. C. London, 1863, 8vo. 2238. c.
- JUSTINUS. *Historiæ Philippicæ, cum versione Anglica*. London, 2d ed. 1735, 8vo.
- Nothing whatever is known of the soi disant Justin, who abbreviated in this, the work of Trogus Pompeius. The latter flourished in the Augustan age. "Justin" was probably a monk of the seventh (not the fourth) century.
- JUVENAL. *Satires*. Latin and English texts. London, 1745, 8vo.
- KEARY (C. F.) "Norway and the Norwegians." London, 1892, 8vo.
- KEIGHTLEY (Thomas). *Ovid's Fasti, with Notes*. London, 1848, 12mo.
- *Mythology of Ancient Greece and Italy*. London, 1859, 8vo.
- Keightley's works are more remarkable for what they ignore, than what they communicate, on the subject of ancient mythology.
- KEMBLE (Johannis M.) *Codex Diplomaticus Ævi Saxonici Opera*. London, 1839, 6 vols, 8vo. Containing Latin texts relating to Britain, from A. D. 604 to 1066.
- *The Saxons in England*. Ed. W. De G. Birch. London, 1876, 2 vols, 8vo. 2071. d.
- KENYON (F. G.) *Aristotle on the Athenian Constitution*. London, 1891, 8vo.
- In ch. XLIII there are eight lines of astronomy interpolated which will not be found in the original. See *Classical Review*, December, 1891.
- KINGSLEY (C.) *Rev. The Roman and the Teuton*. London, 1864, 8vo.
- KIP (William) *Bishop of California*. Christmas Holidays in Rome. Boston, 1869, 8v.
- LAING (Samuel). *The Younger*. Human Origins. London, 1892, 8vo. 7704. e. 2.
- LAJARD (Jean B. F.) *Le Grand Bas-relief Mythriaque*. Paris, 1828, 4to. 7820. g.
- *Mysteries of Mithra: Text*. Paris, 1847, 4to. (Les planches en folio.) 557. g.
- *Mysteries de Mithra: Ouvrage posthume*. Paris, 1867, 4to. 560. d.
- LA LOUBIÈRE (Simon de). *Le Siam*. The Kingdom of Siam, done out of French, by A. P. London, 1693, 2 tom., fol. 983. h.
- LANCIANI (Rodolfo), *LL.D. Harv.* *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*. London, 1888, 8vo., illustrated.
- LA PLACE (P. S. de). *System of the World*. Tr. by J. Pond. London, 1809, 2 vols, 12mo.
- LAPPENBERG (J. M.) *History of England under Anglo-Saxon Kings*. London, 1845.
- LE BLANT (Edmond). *L'Épigraphie chrétienne en Gaule et dans l'Afrique romaine*. Paris, 1890, 8vo. 07708. f. 24.
- LECOINTRE-DUPONT (Gabriel). *Lettres sur l'histoire monétaire de la Normandie et du Perche*. Paris, 1846, 8vo.
- LE GENTIL DE LA GALAISIÈRE (Guillaume). *Voyage dans le Mers de l'Indie à l'occasion du passage de Venus en 1761 et 1769*. 1770-81, 2 tom, 4to. 982. h. 9.
- LEON (Joachin Velasquez de). *Management of the Royal Mines in Mexico and petition for the abolition of the royal dues*. 1774, fol. 9771. h. 2. (18.)
- LETRONNE (Jean Antoine). *Observations zodiacales*. Paris, 1824, 8vo. 1140. d. g. (4.)
- LEVESQUE (Jean L.) *De Burigny*. Hist. des revolutions de l' Empire de Constantinople—jusqu'à l'an 1453. Paris, 1750, 3 t. 12mo. 1053. a. (9.)
- *Hist. de la Philosophie Payenne*. La Haye, 1724, 12mo. 525. a. 19.
- LEWIS (Sir George Cornewall). *Astronomy of the Ancients*. London, 1862, 8vo. 2244. h. 4.
- LILLIE (Arthur). *Buddha and Early Buddhism*. London, 1881, 8vo. 4505. ee. 11.
- LIUTPRANDUS. *Historia ejusque Legatio ad Nicephorum Phocane*. In *Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ*, 1828, 8vo.
- LOBECK (Christian A.) *Aglaopharmus sive de theologiæ mysticæ Græcorum causis . . . idemque Postarum Orphicorum dispersus reliquias collegit*, 2 tom. Regiomontii Prussorum, 1824, 8vo. 4505. aaa.
- *Disputationis de mysterium Eleusinorum*. 1824, 4to. 8357. ccc. 3. (4.)

- LOESCHER (Valentin Ernst). *Literator Celta*. Lipsiæ, 1726, 8vo. 1332. a. 5.
- LOPES FERNANDES (Manuel Barnardo). *Memoria dos medalhas e condecorações portuguezas e das estrangeiras com relacao a Portugal*. (With plates.) Lisbon, 1861, 4to. 7755. cc. (15.)
- *Memoria das moedas correntes em Portugal desde o tempo dos Romanos, até o anno de 1856*. Lisbon, 1856, 4to. 7757. f. (16.)
- LORD (Henry). *Rev.* Religion of the Banians, Parsees, etc. 1752, fol. 215. e. (6.)
- LOWNDES (William). *Essay for the Amendment of Silver Coins*. London, 1695, 8vo.
- LYSONS (Samuel). *Reliquiæ Brit. Romanæ*. London, 1801, 2 vols, fol. 562. g.
- MABILLON (Jean). *Abbé. Vetera Analecta*. Paris, 4 vols, 8vo., 1675-85.
- MACFARLAN (Robert). *Dissertation on the pretended identity of the Getæ and Scythians*. London, 1799, 8vo. 600. f. 1.
- MAGNUS (Nicholas). *Essay on Insurances*. London, 1755, 2 vols, 4to. 50. d. 14.
- MAINE (Sir Henry). *Roman Law*.
- MALLET (Paul Henry). *Northern Antiquities*. Trans. by Bishop Percy. London, 1826, 3 vols, 8vo. Another ed., London, 1847, 1 vol., 8vo. 2500 a.
- MANDRELL (Henry). *Rev.* Travels in Palestine, 1697. London, 1847, 8vo. 2500. b.
- MANILIUS (Marcus). *Sometimes written Manlius*. *Astronomicum*, ex editione Bentleiana, cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini, variis lectionibus, notis variorum, (Scaligeri, notas, etc.) London, 1828, 2 vols, 8vo. 2055. c.
- MARIANA (Juan de), *Jesuit*. *History of Spain*. Trans. by Capt. J. Stevens. London, 1699, fol. 2 pts. 181. g. (1.)
- This work contains proofs that the Julian æra was used in Spain until about the time of the Discovery of America.
- MARTIN DU TYRAC, *Comte de Marcellus*. *Souvenirs de l'Orient*. Paris, 1839, 2 t., 8v.
- MASCOU (John Jacob). *History of the Ancient Germans and Norsemen*. Trans. by Thomas Lediard. London, 1738, 2 vols, 4to. 173. g. 1-2.
- An able and useful work, marred by national partiality. According to the writer, Germany comprehended Schleswig-Holstein, Scandinavia, and parts of Gaul, Dacia, Scythia, etc. It was a relief to find that it did not also include China and America!
- MASCOVIUS (Gottfridus). *De Sectis Sabianorum et Proculianorum in Jure Civili*, etc. Altdorfii Noricorum, 1724, 8vo. pamph., 83 pages. 700. h.
- MASPERO (Gaston). *Egyptian Archæology*. Tr. by Miss Amelia B. Edwards. London, 1887, 8vo. 2259. b. 8.
- *Life in Ancient Egypt*. London, 1892, 8vo. 7702. a. 39.
- MASSEY (Gerald). *A Book of the Beginnings*. London, 1881, 2 vols, 4to. 7703. g. 22.
- *The Natural Genesis*. London, 1883, 2 vols, 4to. 7703. 922.
- MAURICE (Thomas). *Indian Antiquities*. London, 1806, 7 vols (in 3), 8 vo. 1434. g.
- *Brahminical Fraud Detected*. London, 1812. 8vo. 1114. i. 5.
- MELON (Jean). *Essay on Commerce*. Tr. by D. Bindon. London, 1738, 8v. 8247. bbb.
- MELVILLE (Henry). *Veritas: Revelation of Mysteries by means of the Median and Persian laws*. (An astrological treatise.) London, 1874, 4to. 1891. p. 13.
- MEURSIUS (Joannes), *The Elder*. *Denarius Pythagoricus sive de Numerorum usque ad dinarium qualitate ac nominibus secundum Pythag.* Lug. Bat. 1631, 4to. 602. c. 14.
- *Historiæ Danicæ*. Amsterdami, 1638, fol. 155. b. 13.
- MICHAELIS (J. D.) *Hebrew and Julian months compared*. London, 1773, 8vo. 8561. a. 24.
- *Dissertation on the same*, by W. Carpenter, of Islington. London, 1825, 12mo.
- MIGNÉ (J. P.) *Epistolarum, libri X*, 1844, 4to. 3621. a. 10.
- MILLINGEN (James V.) *Ancient unedited Monuments*. London, 1822-6. 4to. 557. e.
- MIR KHWAND, or "MIRKHOND." (Muhammad Ibn Khavand Shah.) *History of the Early Kings of Persia*. Trans. by D. Shea. London, 1832, 8vo. 752. g. 19.
- MOMMSEN (Theodor). *Zum Romischen Kalendar*, 1860, 8vo. 8560. c.
- MONASTIER (Antoine). *Rev.* *History of the Vaudois Church*. London, 1848, 8vo.
- MONTALEMBERT (Charles de), *Comte*. *The Monks of the West*. English tr. London 1861, 7 vols, 8vo. This work is dedicated to the Pope of Rome.
- MONTESQUIEU (Charles de Secondat, *Baron de*). *Works complete*. Dublin, 1777, 4 vols, 4to. Another ed., London, 1878, 2 vols, 8vo.
- MUNRO (Charles H.) *Digest XIX, 2*; a translation of that portion of Justinian's Digest which relates to Locati-Conducti, with commentary. Cambridge, 1891, 8vo.
- *De Furtis (Digest XLVII, 2)*. Cambridge, 1893, 8 vols. 5206. aa. 13.
- MURATORI (Lodovico Antonio). *Index to the Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian sacramentaries, according to M's Liturgia Romana Vetus*, by H. A. Wilson, 1892, 8vo.

- NASH (D. W.) *The Pharaoh of the Exodus*. London, 1863, 8vo. 9061. e. 15
- NEPOS (Cornelius). *Lives of Illustrious Men*. Eng. Tr., Oxford, 1684, 12mo.
- NEWTON (Isaac), *Sir*. *Prophecies of Daniel*. London, 1733, 4to. 3185. h.
- NICOLAS (Nicholas Harris), *Sir*. *The Historic Peerage of England*. First ed., 1825, revised and continued by W. Courthope. London, 1857, 8vo. 2119. b.
- *Chronology of History*. (Lardner's Cabinet Library.) London, 8vo. 2103. c.
- NIEBUHR (Barthold Georg). *History of Rome*. Tr. by Hare. London, 1847-51, 3v. 8v.
- *Lectures on the Hist. Rome*, ed. by L. Schmitz, 3rd ed. Lon., 1870, 8vo. 2382. c.
- NISARD. *Collection des Auteurs Latins, avec la traduction en Français, publiée sous la direction de M. Nisard*. Paris, 1848, 30 tomes, 8vo.
- OHLENSCHLAGER (Adam Gottlob). *Die Götter Nordens*. Leip., 1829, 8vo. 11,557. bb. 17.
- OPPERT (Gustav.) *Aborigines of Bharata-Varsha (India)*. Lon., 1893, 8vo. 10,007. cc. 15.
- OSBORN (Robt. D.) *Islam under the Arabs*. London, 1876, 8vo.
- *Islam under the Khalifs of Bagdad*. London, 1878, 8vo.
- OVERBEEK VAN (Bonaventure). *Les Restes de l'ancienne Rome*. Paris, 1700, fol.
- *Stampe degli avanzi dell'Antica Roma rinovata*. Londra, 1739, fol. 561. f.
- OWEN (T. M.) *Hist. of England to the Norman Conquest*. London, 1882, 8vo. 9503. c. 10.
- PAGNINI DELLA VENTURA (Giovanni F.) *Della Moneta de Fiorentin*. (In Lanetti's *Nova raciaita delle monete*, etc.) 1755, etc, fol. 603. i. 9.
- PALGRAVE (Sir Francis). *Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth*. London, 1832, 2 vols, 4to. 597. h. 13.
- *History of the Anglo-Saxons*. London, 1887, 8vo.
- PARRY (Ch. H.) *The Parliaments and Councils of England*. London, 1839, 8vo. 809. g. 1.
- PAULLY (A. F. von). *Realencyclopädie*. Stuttgart, 1893, 8vo. 2282. f. 2.
- PENN (John). *Of Stokepark, near Windsor*. *Observations in Illustration of Virgil's Fourth Eclogue*. London, 1810, 8vo. 1000. i. 20.
- PERROT AND CHIPIEZ. *A History of Art in Ancient Egypt, from the French of Georges Perrot and Charles Chipiez*. London, 1883, 2 vols, 4to.
- PERSIUS (Aulus Persius Flaccus). *Satires*. (Written about A. D. 60.) Tr. by Sir Wm. Drummond. London, 1797, 8vo. 237. f. 33.
- PETAU (*Father Denis*). *History of the World*. London, 1659, fol. 1309. k. 4.
- *De Veteri anno Rom. Kalendarium vetus Rom*. 1694, etc., tom. 8, fol. 2068. e.
- PETER (Carl). *Zeittafeln der Römischer Geschichte*. Hale, 1841, 4to. 1307. i.
- PFEFFEL, VON KRIEGLSTEIN (Christian Frederick). *Abrege Chronologique de l'histoire et du droit public d'Allemagne*. Paris, 1766, 2 vols, 8vo.
- PHLEGON (*of Tralles*). *De mirabilibus et longævis libellus*. Eiusdem de Olymp. Fragmentum. Greek and Latin. 1568, 8vo. 704. b. (21.)
- PIKE (L. Owen). *The English and their Origin*. London, 1866.
- PINKERTON (John). *Geographer, Medallist, and Antiquarian of Edinburgh*. *History of Scotland to Malcolm III.*, (A. D. 1056,) with a Dissertation on the Origin and Progress of the Scythians. New ed. Edinburgh, 1814, 2 vols, 8vo. 10,370. d. 3.
- *Dissertation on the Goths*. London, 1887, (reprint,) 8vo. 1194. g. 1.
- PITTAKYS (K. S.) *L' Ancienne Athènes, ou la description des Antiquities d'Athènes et de ces environs*. Athens, 1835, 8vo. 1299. c. 8vo.
- PLATO. *The Dialogues (including the Laws)*. Tr. B. Jowett. Oxford, 1875, 5 vols, 8vo.
- PLINY (*The Elder*). *Natural History*. London, 1848, 6 vols, 8vo. [Some portions of a much better English translation were published by the Wernerian Club of Oxford, now defunct.] 2500. g.
- PLINY (*The Younger*). *Panegyric upon Trajan*. London, 1730, 8vo. 5. 1633-5.
- *Epistles*. London, 1786, 2 vols, 8vo. Melmoth's Translation.
- PLUTARCH. *Lives*. Tr. by J. Langthorne. London, 1825, 2 vols, 8vo.
- *Isis and Osiris*. Tr. by Rev. Samuel Squire, Bishop of St. Davids. Greek and English. Cambridge, 1744, 8vo. 704. 8. 10.
- POCOCKE (Edward). *India in Greece; containing the sources of the Hellenic race, the Buddhistic propaganda in Greece, etc*. London, 1852, 8vo. 4505. c.
- POCOCKE (Richard). *Bishop of Ossory and of Meath*. *Description of the East*. Pinkerton's Voyages. London, 1808, 4to. 2057. d.
- POLLUX (Julius). *Textrium Antiquorum; with an appendix on the Onomasticon*, by J. Yates. London, 1843, 8vo. 1400. g. 3.
- POLYBIUS. *The histories of*. Trans. by E. S. Shuckburgh. Lon., 1889, 8vo. 9041. b. (38.)
- POOLE (R. S.) *Chronology of Ancient Egypt*. London, 1851, 8vo. 9061. e. (11.)

- POTHIER (Robert J.) *Pandectæ Justinianæ*. Paris, 1748, fol. 5205. h. (1.)
 ——— Another ed. Paris, 1818, 5 vols, 4to. 17. b. 13-17.
 ——— The Law of Contracts. Eng. Trans. London, 1806, 2 vols, 8vo. 496. e. 16.
 ——— Another ed. Philadelphia, 1853, 8vo. 5423, dd. 3.
 ——— Contract of Sale. Boston, 1839, 8vo. 496. d. 20.
 POTOSÍ. Un Memorial, etc. A memorial on the affairs of Potosí addressed to the King of Spain, by J. de Ibarra Gueztaeren. Madrid, 1618, fol. 1324. k. 5. (16.)
 ——— Los Azogueros dueños de minas, etc. A memorial of mine proprietors to the King. Madrid, 1620, fol. 1324. k. 5. (85.)
 ——— Gremio de los Azogueros. Madrid, Nov. 12, 1636, fol. 725. k. 18. (32.)
 PRIDEAUX (Humphrey), *Dean of Norwich*. *Marmora Oxoniensia ex Arundellianis*. . . Conflata. . . Recensuit. Oxonii, 1676, fol. 604. h. 3.
 PRIESTLEY (Joseph), *Rev.* History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ. Birmingham, 1786, 4 vols, 8vo.
 The philosophical and theological works of Priestley, of which latter this is the principal one, are both numerous and verbose. They wholly fail to explain the history of Christianity.
 PROBUS (Marcus Valerius). Leipsig, 1826, 8vo. 2053. g.
 PROCOPIUS, of *Casarea*. Wars of Justinian. Lon., 1653, f. Tr. Sir H. Halcroft. 9073. h. 5.
 ——— Secret Hist. of the Court of Justinian. Tr. into Eng., 1674, Lon., 8vo. 1053. a. 2.
 ——— Histoire secrete de Justinien. M. Isambert, Paris, 1856, 8vo. Gr. and Fr. 9135. d.
 PRUDENTIUS (Aurelius Clemens). Selections from Prudentius, trans. into English by F. St. J. Thackeray. London, 1890, 8vo. 3435. gg. 1.
 These selections are from the religious hymns and poems adapted by Prudentius from the ancient liturgy, or ascribed to him by later composers.
 PTOLEMY (Claudius). *Tetrabiblos*. Tr. by J. Wilson. London, 1820, 12mo. 718. c. 39.
 ——— Hypotheses et Epoques des Planetes, by the Abbé Halma. Paris, 1820, 4to. 49. e. 5.
 ——— Table Chronologique des Reynes, by the Abbé Halma. Paris, 1819, 4to. 49. e. 4.
 QUATREMÈRE (Étienne Marc). *Memoires geographiques et historiques sur l'Égypte*, etc. Paris, 1811, 8vo. (Describes the Egyptian Gold Mines of Antiquity.) 1298. c. 11.
 QUATREMÈRE DE QUINCY (Antoine Chrysostome). Sur le statue antique de Venus. Paris, 1821, 4to. 561. *d. 29.
 QUINCEY (Thomas de). Works of. Edinburgh, 1889-90, 14 vols, 8vo. 12,274. c.
 RAMBAUD (Alfred). History of Russia. London, 1882-6, 3 vols, 8vo. 2392. d.
 RANKE (Carl F.) *De Lexici Hesychiani*. Lipsiæ, 1831, 8vo. 12,923. b. 14.
 RECLUS (Élisée). The Earth. New York, 1871, 8vo.
 RECUPERO (Giuseppe). *Storia naturale e generale dell'Etna*. Opera postuma. Catania, 1815, 2 tom., 4to. 1254. k. 19. 20.
 REEVES (John). History of the English Law from the Saxons to Philip and Mary. London, 1787-1829, 5 vols, 8vo. 508. b. 17-22.
 REITEMEIER (J. F.) *Geschichte des Berghauses*. Gottingen, 1785, 8vo. 725. a. 24.
 RHALLÈS (Georgios Alexandros) and POTLES (Michael). *Canons of the Greek Church*. Athens, 1852-59, 6 vols, 8vo. 05107. ee. 1. (2.)
 RICKARD (R.) The Era Calendar. Birmingham, 1884, 12mo. 1881. a. 4. (67.)
 RIVERO and TSCHUDI. *Peruvian Antiquities*. Tr. by F. L. Hawks. N. Y. 1853, 8vo. 9772. d.
 ROBERTSON (W. A. S.) *Roman Canterbury*. London, 1883, 8vo.
 RODIER (Gabriel). *Les races humaines; chronologie, etc.* Paris, 1862, 8vo. 9006. gg. 18.
 ROUGEMONT (Frederic de). *L'histoire de l'astronomie*. Paris, 1865, 12mo. 4378. b.
 ——— *La Peuple Primitive*. Geneve, 1855-7, 3 toms., 12mo. 10,006. d. e.
 RUDBECK (Olaf). *Lingua veteris Scytho-Scandicæ sive Gothicæ*. Upsalæ, 1691, fol.
 ——— *Atlants*. Swedish and Latin texts. Stockholm, 1863, fol. (Originally printed in Upsal, 1702. The fourth vol., which was only completed to p. 210, is here reprinted in facsimile.) 9435. i.
 RUGGIERO (Ettore). *Dizionario Epigrafico de Antichita Romane*. Roma (Loreto Pasqualacci) 1886-93, 8vo. In 1898 it was completed to the letter E. 769.
 RUSSELL (Dr. William). History of Europe. London, 1810, 6 vols, 8vo.
 RYGH (O.) *Norse Oldsager*. Christiania, 1835, 3 vols, 4to.
 SACRO BOSCO (Joannes de). *La Sphere pour prouver que l'astrologie est très utile et nécessaire au genre humain*. Paris, 1584, 12mo. 533. b. 5. (2.)
 SAINT-CHAMANS (August de). *Viscount*. *Traité d'Economie publique suivé d'un aperçu sur les finances de la France*. 3 tom., Paris, 1852, 8vo. 8206. d. (29.)
 SATOW (Ernest). The Jesuit Mission Press in Japan, 1591-1610. 1888, 4to. 11,899. h. 33.
 SAVARY (C. E.) *Letters on Egypt*. Tr. from the Fr. London, 1787, 2 v. 8vo. 1047. f. 6-7.

- SAVIGNY (Fred. Karl von). *Geschichte des Romischen Rechts*. Heidelberg, 1815-31, 6 vols, 8vo.
- SCARTH (H. M.) *Rev.* Roman Britain. London, 1883, 8vo. An able and interesting work, drawn from antiquarian sources. 4419. i. 39.
- SCARUFFI (Gasparo). *L'Altimonfo*. From the 1582 folio edition, included in the *Scrittori Italiani Classici*. 1803, 8vo. 1140. e.
- SCHRAM (Robert). *Eclipses of the Sun in India*. 1896, 8vo. 8561. h. (44.)
- SCOTT (Wm. A.) *Ph. D.* *Reputation of State Debts*. 1893, 8vo. 08,225. ee.
- SCOTUS (Johannes Erigena). *Ein Beitrag zur geschichte de Philosophie und Theologie im Mittelalter*. 1861, 8vo. (Including Usury, etc.) 8466. bbb. (27.)
- SELDEN (John). *Titles of Honour*. London, 1631, fol. 2119. f.
- *Liber de Nummis*. London, 1678, 8vo.
- *Table Talk*. (Reprint.) London, 1869, 8vo.
- SENECA (Lucius Anæus). *De Beneficiis* (lib. V is cited in the "Mist Money" case).
- *Claudii Cæsaris Apocolokintosis*. A work in which the author ridicules the deification of the Emperor Claudius.
- SEWELL (Robert). *First report on the Kristna district of the Madras Presidency*. Madras, 1878, fol. 7702. k. (13.)
- *Southern India Chronological Tables*, 1894, 8vo. 8562. ff. (34.)
- SHARIF (Jafar). *Customs of the Musselmans of India*. Madras, 1863, 4to. 10,056. f.
- SHARPE (Samuel). *Orientalist*. *History of Egypt*. London, 1849, 2 vols, 8vo. 2502. d.
- SHIRBURN (Sir Edward). *The Astronomicon of M. Manilius*. London, 1675, 8vo.
- SILVESTRE DE SACEY (Antoine Isaac), *Baron*. *Essai sur les Mystères d'Eleusis*, etc. 1816, 8vo. 1363. f. (39.)
- *Exposé de la Religion des Druzes . . . et la vie du Khalife Hakem*, etc. Paris, 1838, 8vo., 2 vols. 696. k. (20-21.)
- SMITH (Ch. R.) *Antiq. of Richborough, Reculver and Lymne*. Lon., 1850, 4to. 10,350. d.
- *Antiquities of Trèves, Mayence, Wiesbaden, Niederbieber, Bonn and Cologne*. London, 1851, 8vo. 7707. c. 26.
- *Illustrations of Roman London*. London, 1859, 4to. 2259. f.
- SOETBEER (Adolphe). *Litteraturnachweis über Geld und Münzwesen insbesondere über der währungsstreit, 1871-91*, etc. Berlin, 1892, 8vo. 08,227. e. 35.
- SONNERAT (Pierre). *Voyage aux Indes*. Paris, 1806, 2nd ed., 8vo. 566. d. 6.
- *Voyage to the East Indies and China*. Tr. by F. Magnus. Calcutta, 1788-9, 3 vols, 8vo. 010,057. ee. 22.
- SOUCIET (Father E.) *Jesuit*. *Observations mathématiques, astronomiques, géographiques, chronologiques, et physiques, tirées les anciens Chinois*. Paris, 1729, 4to. 50. d. 10.
- SPEED (John). *History of Great Britain*. London, 1650, fol.
- SQUIRE (Samuel), *Bish. of St. David's*. *Greek Chronol. Cam.*, 1741, 8vo. 580. e. 26.
- STANLEY (Thomas), *the Elder*. *Hist. of Philosophy*. Lon., 1743, 4to., 4th ed., 523. k. 5.
- STATE PAPERS. *Calendar of, Domestic Series*, (annual,) London, 1866, 8vo.
- STATUTES AT LARGE (of Great Britain). Edited by Danby Pickering, *Reader of the Law Lecture to Gray's Inn*. Cambridge, 1762, 8vo.
- STOW (John), *Antiquarian*. *Survey of London*. Carrisbrooke Library, reprint. London, 1889, 8vo. 012,207. i.
- STUBBS (William), *Rev., late Regius Prof. of Mod. Hist.*, Oxon. *Chronica Magistri, Rogeri de Hovedene*. London, 1858, 8vo. 2073. g.
- *Constitutional History of England*. Oxford, 1880, 3 vols, 8vo. 2320. b. 5.
- *Seventeen Lectures on Medieval and Mod. Hist.* Oxford, 1886, 8vo. 9073. e. 13.
- *The Early Plantagenets*, 2nd ed., 12mo. London, 1877.
- SUIDAS. *Cæsarum Vitæ*. 1563, fol. 815. m. 3.
- SULLIVAN (J.) *La Féodalité*. Jersey, 1885, 8vo. A brochure on the feudal system and especially as to existing survivals in the island of Jersey.
- SUMNER (Wm. G.) *The Financier and the Finances of the American Revolution*. New York, 1891, 8vo. 08,227. h. (15.)
- SYMMACHUS. *Epistolacum Symmachi V. C. præfecti Urbi, libri duo*. 10,905. c. 37
- TAYLOR (Robert), *Rev.* *The Diegesis; being a Discovery of the Origin, Evidences and Early History of Christianity*. London, 1841, 8vo.
- *Syntagma*. London, 1884, (Reprint,) 8vo.

- TAYLOR (Thomas). *The Platonist*. Eleusinian Mysteries. 1790, 8vo. 704. e. 12.
 — Aristotle's Treatise of Animals. 1809, 4to. 520. e. 5.
 — Fragments of a Treatise on Religion by the Emperor Julian, (A.D. 361-3.) preserved by Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, to which are added some other fragments of Julian's, relative to the Christians. Tr. into Eng. London, 1809, small 8vo. pp. 98. (Very rare, only 25 copies having been privately printed, nearly all of which were destroyed.) The same reprinted in London, 1873. 3670. b.
 — Iamblicus on the Mysteries of the Egyptians. 1821, 8vo. 8460. d.
 — Mystical Hymns of Orpheus. 1824, 8vo. 11,335. c. 33.
 — Pausanias. Itinerary of Greece. Tr. into Eng. London, 1824, 3 vols. 8vo. 1299. c. 10.
 — Translations of the Fragments of Ocellus Lucanus (B.C. 500), on the Nature of the Universe; Taurus, (the Platonist,) on the Eternity of the World; Julius Firmicus Maternus, on the Thema Mundi or Geniture of the World (from the third book of the Mathesis); and Proclus, (A.D. 412-85), on the Perpetuity of Time. London, 1831, small 8vo, pp. 96. 8461. bbb. 15.
 TEIXEIRA DE ARAGAO (A. C.) *Descripcao historica das moedas Romanas existentes no gabinete numismatico de Sua Magestade El Rei . . . Dom Luiz I.* Lisboa, 1870, 8vo, pp. 640. 7756. bbb. (7.)
 — *Descripcao geral e historica das moedas cunhadas em nome dos reis, regentes, e governadores de Portugal.* Lisboa, 1874, 8vo. 7757. dd. (7.)
 TERRIEN (de Lacouperie). *Mém. Soc. of Bib. Archaeol.* Early History of Chinese Civilization. London, 1880, 8vo. 9057. a.
 — Paper Money of China. London, 1882, 8vo. 7756. bbb. 16.
 THEODOSIUS. *Codex Theodosianus*, ed. G. Haenal. 1841, 4to. 705. h. (17-18).
 THEOGNIS *the Megarean*. Fragments. Tr. by Rev. J. Banks. Bound with Hesiod. London, 1856, 8vo. 2500. f.
 THIERRY (Aug.) *The Norman Conquest of Britain.* London, 1856, 8vo.
 THOMPSON (Henry), *Rev.* History of Roman Literature. London. 1852, 8vo.
 On page 120 appears a representation of the Obelisk of Augustus.
 THUCYDIDES. Tr. by Rev. William Smith, about 1740. Reprint, London, 1892, 8vo.
 TORFÆUS (Thormodus). "Arcades," or Ancient History of Orkney. Tr. by Rev. A. Pope. Wick, 1866, 12mo. 9509. e. 3.
 TOULLIER (Charles B. M.) *Le droit civil expliqué.* Paris, 1845, 8vo. 5403. ee.
 TOWNSEND (George H.) *Manual of Dates.* London, 1877, 8vo.
 TROP LONG (Raymond T.) *Le droit civil.* Paris, 1845-55, 8vols. 8vo. 5403. e.
 TURNER (Sharon). *Tal-iesin, the Bard.* London, 1803, 8vo. 1064. l. 1.
 — *History of the Anglo Saxons.* London, 8vo.
 TWISS (*Sir Travers*). *Money and Currency.* Oxford, 1843, 8vo. 1390. f. 50. (3.)
 — *View of the Progress of Political Economy in Europe since the 16th Century.* London, 1847, 8vo. 1390. d. (12.)
 ULUGH BEG, *afterwards christened Juan de Persia, q. v.*
 UPHAM (Edward). *History of Buddhism.* London, 1829, fol. 1232. k.
 VAIRASSE (Denis). *A voyage to Sevarambia.* Tr. from the Fr. ed. of 1675. Included in "Travels into several remote nations of the world." Vol. III, p. 12. London, 1727, 8vo. 12,612. d. 22.
 VALLANCEY (Charles). *Ancient History of Ireland.* Dublin, 1786, 8vo. 982. d. 8.
 — *Primitive Inhabitants of Britain and Ireland.* Dublin, 1807, 8vo. 5795. (1.)
 VALERIANI (Gætano). *La Vita di Gesu Cristo*, (reprint.) 1869, 8vo. 4807. aa.
 VEDAS, THE. *The Threefold Science of the Iyotish udhyayu of the Veda.* Rev. J. Stevenson. Bombay, 1833, 4to. 14,007. c. 1.
 — *The Main Results of Modern Vaidik Researches*, by Ram-chandra Ghosha. Calcutta, 1870, 8vo., pp. 57. 4505. c. 10.
 — *Hymns of the Rigveda.* R. T. H. Griffith. Benares, 1889, 8vo. 14,007. cc. 17.
 — *Sacred Books of the East.* Max Müller. Oxford, 1879, 8vo. 2003. b.
 VERSTEGAN (Richard). *A restitution of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities, concerning the most noble and renowned English nation.* (Eds., Antwerp, 1605; London, 1628; 1634; 1655; and 1673.) London, 1673, 8vo. 7707. b. 29.
 VINING (Edward P.) *An inglorious Columbus. or evidence that Hwui Shan and a party of Buddhist monks from Afghanistan discovered America in the fifth century.* New York, 1885, 8vo. 9551. i. 5.

- VOLNEY (C. F. Chassebœuf de), *Count*. Œuvres complètes. Paris, 1838, 8 tom., 8vo.
(These works include Meditations on the Ruins of Empire; Travels in Egypt and Syria; Climate and Aboriginal Inhabitants of the United States of America; New Researches into Ancient History; and Treatise on the Alphabets and Languages of Europe and Asia.) 12,235. k. 2.
- VOLTAIRE (Arouet de). Essai sur l'histoire générale. Paris, 1756, 7 vols. in 4, 8vo.
—— History of Europe. London, 1754, 3 vols, 8vo. 582. d. 2-5. (1.)
—— Another ed., 1758, 3 vols, 8vo. 582. b. 3-5.
- WEEDEN (William R.) Economic and Social History of New England, 1620-1789. New York, 1890, 2 vols, 8vo. 9602. de. g.
- WHISTON (William A.) Vindication of the Sibylline Oracles; to which are added the genuine Oracles themselves, in Greek and English. London, 1715, 8vo. 873. i. 23.
- WIARDA (Tileman Dothias). Geschichte und Auslegung des Salschen Gesetzes. Latin and German texts. Bremen and Zurich, 1809, 8vo. 5606. c.
- WILLIAMS (Sir Monier). Buddhism in its connection with Brahminism and Hinduism. 2nd ed. London, 1890, 8vo. 2212. c. 1.
—— Hinduism. Published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian knowledge. London, 1877, 8vo. 2212. a.
- WIMMER (Ludv. F.A.) Die Runenschrift. Ed. by Dr. F. Holthausen. Berlin, 1887, 8vo. 7708. ee. 41.
- WORSÆ (J. J. A.) The Danes and Norwegians in England. Tr. from the Danish. London, 1852, 8vo.
—— Ancient Norway. Tr. from the Danish.
- WRIGHT (Thomas). The Celt, the Roman and the Saxon. London, 1885, 8vo. (An able work drawn chiefly from antiquarian sources.) 2258. b.
- YANGUAS. Dictionario de Antiquedades., art. "Moneda."
- YARRANTON (Andrew). England's Improvement by Sea and Land; to Outdo the Dutch without Fighting; to Pay Debts without Moneys; to set at Work all the Poor of England with the growth of our own Lands; to prevent unnecessary Suits in Law; with the benefit of a voluntary Register (registration of land titles); directions where vast quantities of Timber are to be had for the building of Ships; with the advantage of making the great Rivers of England navigable; rules to prevent Fires in London and other great Cities; with directions how the several companies of handicraftsmen in London may always have cheap Bread and Drink. London, 1577, 2 vols, 4to. (An ingenious and extremely rare work.)
- ZASIUS (Joannes U.) Epitome in usus feudarum. Lugduni, 1544, 8vo. 5306. a. 2.
- ZOROASTER. Boum-Dehesch, cosmogonie des Parsés; trad. par M. Auguet du Peron. Paris, 1771, 2 tom., 4to. 696. i. 6. 8.

ANCIENT BRITAIN

IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT DISCOVERIES

IN ARCHAEOLOGY, NUMISMATICS, ETC.

CHAPTER I.

ANCIENT BRITAIN.

The name of Britain—The Veneti—The Phœnicians—The Greeks—Greek types of Coins found in Britain—Voyage of Pytheas—Landing of the Norsemen—Torfæus—Archæological remains—Religion—Svastica—Customs—Runic inscriptions—Name of the Sun-God—Tribal names—Place names—Name of London—Venet—Venicones—Venetian glass—Virgil proves, and Bede admits, that the Picts came from Scythia—Norsemen not Germans—The latter theory advanced by the Romans as a claim of dominion—Opinions of antiquarians—Tacitus identifies the Iestians and Britons—Pliny classes together the Massagetæ, Histians, Brittones, and Frisians—The Persians call the Scythians, Sacæ—Tribes found in Britain by the Romans—Baug money—Progress of the Norsemen from Caledonia to South Britain—The Roman Conquest—Counts of the Saxon Shore—The subsequent Gothic revolt.

BRITAIN has been usually regarded as a corruption of Bratanac, or Baratanac, the Phœnician term for “Isles of Tin,” or “Tin Isles,” which the Greeks translated into the equivalent Cassiterides.¹ Anac is advanced as a Syriac term for tin; bedil, commonly translated tin, being regarded to mean lead.² Another verbal theory is based on the story that before the conquest of Britain under Claudius, whilst Germanicus for two years was encamped near the sea shore, east of the Rhine, the sufferings of his troops, from their being obliged to drink brackish water, were alleviated by means of a plant, pointed out to them by the native Frisians, and called “Britannica.” Says Pliny, “the name surprises me, though possibly it may have been so-called because the shores of Britannia are not far distant.” (Nat. Hist., xxv, 6.) Lipsius, in a note to Tacitus, finds a marshy tract, called “Bret-aasche Heyde, upon the west banks of the Ems, between Lingen and Cøvøerden, upon which to base another verbal theory. But aside from

¹ Anderson's “Hist. Commerce,” ed. 1787, I, lxxx.

² Prof. Tychsen, in Beckmann's “Hist. of Inventions,” art. “Tin.” Anac is used in Amos, VII, 7, 8.

the anachronical character of this last suggestion, the locality, which is 60 miles from the sea-shore, is wholly unfit for a camp, and does not coincide with Pliny's description. However, the fact that *Britannia* is mentioned in a work ascribed to Aristotle; (*de Mirabilibus Auscultationes*;) rather disposes of the Bretaasche Heyde theory and confirms Pliny's suspicion that the plant was named after a country, and not the country after the plant. But what country? This question, or rather the broader one, what is the origin of the names Britain and Bretagne, is thoroughly answered by the Roman archæologist Dr. Vincenzo de Vit, in the *Archæological Journal*, vol. XL. He holds that both Britain (England) and Bretagne (France) are named after *Brittia*, or Jutland. Pliny, who lived for thirty years in the northern countries and was well acquainted with them, says (*Nat. Hist.*, IV, 31, 106) that the Menapians, Scalds, Toxandrians, Frisians, and *Britanni* composed the inhabitants of the Low Countries. Hyginus, who wrote "*De Castrorum Munitione*" during the reign of Trajan, mentions (ch. 29 and 30) the Brittones, as furnishing auxiliaries to the Romans, together with the Cantabri, Getæ, and Dacians—all Goths. The "*Brittones*" in Juvenal, XV, 124, and "*Britannia*" in Martial, XI, 3, relate to *Brittia*, not to Albion. The "*Britanni*" conquered by Augustus (*Georgics*, III, 25) were Netherlanders, not Islanders; for Augustus never was in Britain. On a bronze diploma of Domitian, A. D. 85, both *Britannica* and *Brittonum* occur—a conclusive proof that they related to two different peoples. A votive inscription, tempo Trajanos, has been found on the Rhine, near Xanten, dedicated to the "*Matres Brittia*," the Brittian Mother (of the gods). Other votive inscriptions with "*Brittones*" and "*Brit.*" have been found in the Oden-wald, between the Neckar and Maine. Procopius (*Gothic Wars*, IV, 20) mentions the isle (the peninsular of Jutland was then deemed an island) of "*Brittia*," which is situated between Britain (Albion) and Thule (Scandinavia), about 200 stadia from the Rhine. It is inhabited by Angles and Frisians called "*Brittones*." These and many other like evidences render it all but certain that Britain was named, as London was named, from places in the mother country of the namers; and that that mother country was Scandinavia.

Britain was known to the Phœnicians a thousand years before our æra, and may have been known to the Veneti of the Euxine at a still earlier date. It was known to the Carthaginians so early as 600 B. C., and to the Greeks before the time of Herodotus; for he mentions it as the Cassiterides, or Tin Islands. It was doubtless visited by Pytheas of Marseilles during the æra of Alexander the Great. Native imitations

of the Greek coins of this period have been found in many parts of Britain. It was even known to the East Indians, who got their tin from it.³ Yet the monkish chroniclers assure us that the Northmen, who lived close to it, knew nothing of it until it was conquered, in the fifth century, by Hengist and Horsa. This idle tale will receive further attention as we proceed. For the present we shall dismiss it altogether and proceed to advance the reasons for believing that Britain was known to and settled by maritime tribes from the Baltic and North Seas, not only before the Gothic uprisings of the fourth and fifth centuries, but even before the Roman conquest.

Torfæus, in his "Orcades," claims that his countrymen discovered Britain in the fourth century before the Christian æra and colonized it a century later. By itself this testimony would be of little worth, but it receives confirmation from sources whose correctness is hardly open to dispute. At every step of his progress throughout the British isles the antiquarian meets with the remains of an invading or colonizing race, who in point of time must have preceded the Romans, and yet who were neither aboriginals, Phœnicians, Greeks, Iberians, Germans, nor Gauls. These colonists were tall and powerful men, fair-haired, blue-eyed, and accustomed to the sea. They cultivated the earth, manufactured wooden, bronze, and glass wares, traded with ring-money, fought with bronze weapons, and worshipped a deity whose symbol was the svastika, and to whom they sacrificed horses and sometimes men. These evidences all point to the Veneti and other Norse tribes of the Baltic. "On the right-hand coast of the Suevian Sea," says Tacitus, "dwell the Iestians, whose dress and manners are Suevian, whilst their language is British (*lingua Britannicæ proprior*). They cultivate the earth with far more industry than the Germans, they explore the adjacent sea for amber, which they dispose of in commerce. Using no iron, they fight with clubs, and they worship the Mother of the Gods, (*Matrem deorum venerantur*)." That the masters of Iestia at this period were indeed Norsemen is not only proved from the similarity of their language with the British and the close resemblance of ancient Norse and early English,⁴ it is confirmed by the situation of the Gothic metropolis of Venet, and by other circumstances which will be adverted to in the progress of the present work. Although the Iestians had adopted the dress and some

³ Pliny, "Nat. Hist.," xxxiv, 16.

⁴ The language now spoken in the more open parts of Norway, is Danish. The ancient tongue was discouraged and forbidden by the Roman church and driven to the more secluded parts, where it still lingers.

of the habits of the Suevians, whose country they had invaded, yet their more industrious mode of life distinguished them, according to the Roman historian, both from the Suevians and Germans. The antiquities found in Britain perfectly agree with this description. There is nothing to connect them with Germany; there is everything to connect them with Norway, Iestia, Denmark, and the Low Countries.

That remotely the Norsemen issued from that conquering race of Scythia which subdued successively the various powerful nations who encompassed its arid but elevated and bracing table-lands, there can be but little reasonable doubt. The proof lies in their Runic inscriptions and the name of the sun-god, Ies, which they bestowed upon numerous provinces, rivers, and towns. These inscriptions commence on the Yen-Iesei river, near Lake Baikal, and continue westward to Britain, Iesland (Iceland) and Greenland. During the whole of this vast distance, until Britain is passed, the runic inscriptions and place-names derived from Ies are confined between the 50th and 60th parallels of north latitude, an isothermal zone, whose uniform climate affords strong corroboration of the theory deduced from archæological etymology. Westward of the Yen-Iesei the Norsemen appear to have crossed and named the Ieshim, or Ishim, an affluent of the Irtysh, in Siberia. Next we find them in Iestia, or Estya, now Esthonia. In Brandenburg they were known as the Iesidini, or Sidini, and the god they worshipped was called Rada-Gaisus, rada being a Mongolian form of the Indian rajah, or king.⁶ Advancing westward and conquering or amalgamating with the tribes of the coast and the adjacent flat country, they successively crossed and named the Am-Iesus, now the Ems, and the Iessel, or Yessel, now the Saal. Iesleben, or Eisleben, a town of Merseburg, on the Saal, an affluent of the lower Rhine; Iessen, a district of the lower Rhine; Ieserlohn, a town of Westphalia below Cologne; Iesendyck, a town on the Blie eight miles east of Sluys in Flanders; Ober-Iessel and Am-Isia in Frisia (now Emden); and Isigny, a town near Bayeaux, on the north coast of France, all commemorate, in their names, a division of that Norse or Saxon race who eventually fell beneath the sword of Charlemagne. Another division, passing to the northward of the Baltic, left their mark in the names of Up-sala and Ieskilstuna near Stockholm, and of Ieslof and Iestad, towns in Gotland, the latter situated 26 m. S. E.

⁶ The æra of the Rada-Gaisus mentioned by Mascou (VIII, 14) appears to have been about A. D. 406; but there was a more ancient god or hero of the same name, who flourished, or was believed to have flourished, many centuries previously. "Father Jasius, from whom our race is descended," occurs in Virgil's "*Æneid*," III, 168. The chronology of these heroes or demi-gods is given in the author's "*Worship of Augustus Cæsar*."

of Lund, or Lunden. From Scandinavia they undoubtedly crossed to Britain, where one of their tribes was called the Ieseni, or Icenii. They built or dwelt near a town called Lunden, or London, situated upon a river which they called the Tam-Ies and the Romans, the Tam-Issus.⁶ They also built a town named Oxford, on the banks of a river which they called the Ies, or Issus. The great antiquity and Gothic names of these rivers cannot be doubted, for it was also the name of the principal river of the Gothic Veneti, who, ages before, had colonized the shores of the Euxine.⁷

The rock-cuttings of the Yen-Iesei are in Great Permian, near the city of Tzerdyn on the banks of the Tomm, between Tomskoi and Kusnetskoi, and are sculptured on the rocks through which the Yen-Iesei flows. They comprise runic letters, the sign of the cross frequently repeated, a spoked wheel, a heart, and a chase on horseback after wolves. Their general character is similar to the ancient rock-cuttings of Sweden and Iceland, represented in the wood-cuts published by Du Chaillu.⁸ The Jakuhti, (Jaku is one of the names of Buddha,) a pagan nation of ten tribes, comprising about 30,000 taxpayers, still live along the river Lena, near Jakutskoi. They call themselves Zachi. Procopius, iv, 24, mentions the Zachi or Zechi, probably related to Sacæ or Saxons. The Kalmucks, who worship Buddha, designate him as Zacha or Xaca. Formerly the Zachi lived near Lake Baikal, with the Bretti or Bratti, from whom they afterwards separated. They adore a triune god, one of whose personages they suspend in effigy upon a tree whilst in the act of worship. Cer-

⁶ Among several remains of very ancient Norse council-rings, Mallet found one at Lunden, in Scania. It was therefore a place of importance. This Lunden is at the southernmost extremity of the Swedish peninsular. There are other Lundens both in Sweden and Denmark. The Ieseni and Trinobantes, who occupied the country near London, in Britain, when the Romans first took possession of it, were probably Iestians, or Gothic tribes, and it may be reasonably conjectured that, following an almost universal custom, the name of the place was brought by their forefathers from their ancient homes in Gotland and Iestia.

⁷ Hecataeus, in Strabo, xii, 3, 25.

⁸ The rock inscriptions on the Orkhon river, which flows from Karakorum northward into Lake Baikal, contain similar characters, as well as others of a less archaic period. These last are said to be Turkish monuments of the seventh and eighth centuries, mentioning a Turkish prince called Kul-Teghin, whose æra antedates by four or five centuries the first appearance of the Turks in current western literature. The credit of deciphering and publishing these inscriptions belongs to Prof. Thomsen, of Copenhagen, and Dr. W. Radlof, of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg. Trans. Tenth Cong. Orientalists at Geneva, London Times, Sept. 28, 1894. A Turkish prince of the sixth century, Mu-han Khan, the conqueror and successor of Solien Khan of the White Huns, is mentioned in the fragmentary chronicles of the latter. Numismatic Chronicle, 1894, part III.

tain trees are sacred to them. Their year at the present time begins at the vernal equinox, when they light perpetual fires, sacrifice horses, and drink koumiss. Similar fires, lighted by the ancient Cimbri and Gots, also the keeping of the ninth day, are mentioned by Trogus, or Troghill Arnkiels, in his account of the "Religion of the Cimbrian pagans," Hamburg, 1702, and by Adam of Bremen, p. 144. Before they were subdued by the Russians the Zachi used to offer human sacrifices at the graves of their chieftains. They were an exclusively pastoral nation, who practiced polygamy, and sold their wives. Herodotus states that the Veneti had a similar custom. Each tribe of the Zachi had a favourite animal for its ensign, or "totem," as the raven, swan, goose, etc., a custom similar to that of the Iestians, Norsemen and Danes. Many of these details, together with others equally suggestive, will be found in Philip John von Strahlenberg's "Northern and Eastern Europe and Asia." The author was a Swedish officer, who was taken prisoner at the battle of Pultowa, (1709,) and spent thirteen years of captivity in Siberia. The worship of Yen-Iesei or Gan-esa, (him of the twelve sacred names,) and his holy Mother, by tribes still dwelling in the nooks of the Himalaya mountains, is described in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, LIII, 71.

Whatever doubts may remain with regard to the genealogy of the Norse tribes, there can be few with respect to their early settlement and conquest of Britain. Let us begin with the evidences afforded us by the names of tribes and places. The earliest names that have been preserved of the tribes north of the Humber are Norse or Gothic. Thus, parts of Northumbria, Merse and the Lothians, were inhabited by the Ottodini, probably from Otto, a common name among Norse chieftains. At a later period the Ottodini were classed with the Mæataæ, another proof of Norse origin. Other parts of Northumbria and Tiviotsdale were inhabited by the Gadeni, probably a corruption of Gateni, or Getæ. The Selgovæ possibly got their name from the Norse "sil" or sild; the Novantæ, Damnii, Epidii, Gerones, Carnonacæ, Carini, Carnavii, Logi, and Cantæ, were petty tribes who occupied other portions of Scotland at the period of Agricola's conquest. They have usually been classed with the Mæataæ, probably identical with the Mertæ, whom Ptolemy locates in the northwest part of Sutherland. Unless they were Norsemen, or else Aborigines, whom the Norse left behind them in their southward progress and who at a later period united with them against their common enemy, the Roman authorities, there is no clue to their origin. Mæataæ is the original name of the tribe which was afterwards called indifferently Mæataæ or Gaetæ,

a fact due to the absence of the letter G in the early runes and the resemblance of G to M in the later ones. The Venicones of Fife, who had a town named Orrea, which was near the river Ore, were probably Norsemen, all these names being Norse. Dungeness, Fifeness, Arundel, Dover, Canterbury, or Cantabri, Orail, Oxford, Orford, Naze, Nore, and many other English names of places, are derived from Norwegian prototypes; as Arendal, Dovre, Oxenfiord, Ness and Nor. Indeed Norse names of places abound all over Britain, as London, Saturday, Wednesday, Satterthwait, Whitby, Grimsby, Sheerness, and all towns ending in "by," "ford," or "ness."⁹ Not one of these was brought from Germany. The use of the term "dale" for valley, proves Norse settlement. The "bols" of Sutherland and Ross, bespeak the presence of Norsemen. "The Norse foirdr may be discovered under many a strange form, not the least being Knutfiordr, or Cnut's firth, appearing as Knoidert, pronounced in Gaelic, Croderst. Norse place-names occur all the way from Caithness to Cantyre."¹⁰ But such evidence cannot be accepted to prove the presence of Norsemen previous to or during the Roman occupation, unless the period can be ascertained when the Norse names of these places were conferred or employed. The doom-rings, runic inscriptions and other Norse remains found in various parts of Britain, are testimonies of a similar kind. They prove the presence of Norsemen, but not the period of their coming. De Quincy says that the English lake dialects and the names of mountains, tarns, etc., are "pure Danish of the elder form."¹¹ The cockney dialect is evidently derived from that of Osen, where its analogue is still spoken. One has only to travel a month or two in Norway to remark the striking similarity between its inhabitants and those of North Britain, both in stature, hardihood, features, complexion, language, fearless bearing, love of freedom and aptitude for a seafaring life.

Caledonian was the name employed by the earlier Romans to designate all the tribes without the Wall. The name is derived from Cæl or Gæl (Gaul), and dun, a mountain, and meant Gauls of the Mountains, or highlanders. As is elsewhere explained with regard to the Roman use of the word "Germany," this word was erroneous and misleading. The Romans in Britain had made allies of the Norsemen and enemies of the Gæls. Hence they choose to regard all the bar-

⁹ Ness means nose, or cape. It is the same in Russian, Scandinavian, English, French, and Spanish; in short, in the language of every country conquered by the Goths.

¹⁰ Proceedings Society Scottish Antiquarians, April 12, 1886.

¹¹ De Quincy's Works, x, 60, and XIII, 273-83. "Danish of the elder form" means the ancient Norse, now only spoken in the more secluded parts of Norway.

barians without the Wall as Gæls¹²; but this was so far from being true that the later Romans classified them into two races and referred to them by the names which they had given each other. One race was called Scuites, the other Picts. We are told that Scuites meant scutlers or wanderers, and Picts, pickers, or plunderers; but this is mere trifling. Picts was the name of a tribe of Goths who are mentioned as such by Virgil and Claudian.¹³ Scythians, Scuites, and Scots are one word and mean one people.

The name of Veneti is very remarkable. We have elsewhere traced it from the Euxine to the Adriatic. It may be also traced to Tarentum. Cæsar found it at the mouth of the Loire, where the Veneti and Picts had trading stations, which were evidently connected with others in Britain and the Low Countries, for when he attacked them, they sent to Britain and Menapia for aid. They are mentioned, under the name of Vendians, by Tacitus and other Roman writers, as inhabitants of the Baltic coasts. If we may be guided by the names Venicontes and Menapia, they had also stations on the coasts of Scotland and Wales. Little or no mention is made of them during the Dark Ages, but later on they are described as possessing the rich and populous city of Venet, from which they commanded the trade of the Baltic, and which, until they were driven out by Charlemagne, was the capital of the Saxons.¹⁴

The tribes whom the Romans encountered in Britain may be divided into four principal classes. First, the aboriginal Britons, probably from the "isle" of Brittia, or Jutland. Second, the Gæls, whose Druid religion embraced some rites gathered from the Punic and Iberian traders who had visited their shores for tin. Third, the Gothic tribes from the neighborhood of Bergen, Osen, (Oxen,) Lunden, and other places in Norway, whose religion was the worship of Thor, Woden, and Frica, the Mother of Gods.¹⁵ The Iestians alluded to by Tacitus,

¹² Cæsar committed the same blunder: he classed the Picts and Gæls together. De Bell. Gall., III, 11. The country of the Vendians and Picts still goes by their names, Vendée and Poitiers.

¹³ "Pictosque Gelonos," *Georgica*, II, 115; "Perlegit exsanguis Picto moriente figuras." De Bell. Get. 418, tempo Arcadius et Honorius. The word meant "Painted men," or men who tatoo their bodies, as their descendants do to this day.

¹⁴ See further on, chapter xv, on the Pagan Hansa.

¹⁵ There are various monkish legends to account for the name of London, and the reader has ample room for choice between them. The popular one is from Goeffrey of Monmouth, who connects it with the fabulous king Lud. It has the disadvantage of being complicated with the Trojan Æneas, Brutus, etc. To these verbal theories Sir Walter Besant has recently made an addition. What we know for certain is that London had its present name, that is to say, Londinium, the Latin form of it, so early as the period of Tacitus, for it is so written in his *Annals*, XIV, 33. It has also been found on numerous tiles of the same period. *Archæological Journal*, XL, 80.

(the Picts of Virgil and Claudian,) were probably one of those hybrid tribes, whose Gothic fathers, Gelones or Suiones, had amalgamated with native women, Suevians, to the confusion of history and the effacement of racial relations.¹⁶ Fourth, the Belgian tribes from Soissons, Rheims, Bibrax, Artois, Arras, etc., named Suessiones, Regni, Bibroci, and Attreballi, who came into Britain shortly before the first invasion of Cæsar, and whose racial characteristics and religion both seem to have been influenced by contact with the Saxon or Gothic tribes who had previously invaded the Low Countries.

To these tribes may be added the Gælic priests, whose establishment in Britain had been greatly augmented in consequence of the hostile measures of Julius Cæsar in Gaul. That country, once the seat of a powerful hierarchy, was now a political ruin. After passing through the various stages of that feudalism which appears to be the invariable and inevitable consequence of hierarchical government, Gaul had fallen under the sway of a multitude of warring chieftains. To grind them against one another, as Cortes afterwards ground the Toltecs and Aztecs, the Tlascalans, and Mexicans, was no great achievement for the greatest politician of his age. To get rid of the Druidical priests and fill their places with Romans, was a far more difficult task and of greater political importance. The sword and the lash may have sufficed to drive the more stubborn Druids to Britain; but methods less irritating to the remaining Gauls were required to reconcile them to the ministrations of strangers. These were probably the retention of the more tractable priests in Roman ecclesiastical establishments¹⁷; the adoption into the Roman provincial ritual of some of the old Druidical gods, customs, and symbols; and finally, the advancement of the Gaulic chieftains to senatorial and other imperial honours. These measures probably sufficed to ensure that rapid overthrow of the Druidical hierarchy, which had been nearly effected by internal decay before Cæsar invaded their country.

¹⁶ Murphy, in a note to this passage, (Ger. 45,) argues that the British dialect of the Iestians proves affinity to the Gæls of Britain, and that therefore their race was Gælish, or, as he confusedly terms it, "Scythico-Celtic." But there is no affinity between English and Gælic, whilst between English and Norse the affinity is marked. Moreover, it would be difficult to account for the presence of Gæls in Esthonia; whilst that of the Veneti and Norsemen is well attested. Mr. Arthur J. Evans, the archæologist, writes from Oxford to the "Times," under date of September 21, 1893, concerning the recent finds of pottery at Aylesford, in Kent, and of spiral glass ornaments in the Glastonbury fens, that they establish beyond doubt a connection between the Veneti and pre-Roman Britain: an opinion in which he appears to be joined by Prof. Boyd Dawkins. On a Hindu intaglio found at Montrose, in Scotland, consult Trans. Royal Asiat. Soc., Dec., 1830.

¹⁷ An instance of this character is mentioned by Tacitus, *Annals*, I, 57.

Among the most remarkable and distinctive of antiquarian remains which attest the early domination of Norse tribes in Britain, and therefore the fabulous character of the Anglo-Saxon invasion of the fifth century, are the baugs, or ring-money, which, at least in northern Europe, are known to have been used only by the Norse or Gothic tribes. Vast numbers of these rings, which from their size, material, and other circumstances were evidently employed for money, have been found in subterranean hoards in various parts of Britain and Norway. They are frequently mentioned as money in the Norse sagas; and to attest their epoch, they are succinctly described by Cæsar, who informs us that they were used as money by the tribes whom he encountered in Britain.

These evidences and others of the same sort yet to be produced, are mutually corroborative; they crystalize together; they fit each other, and are seen to be parts of one great truth—a truth, that in the fragments of ancient literature and in the fabulous chronicles of the mediæval monks, all of which have emanated from the same Sacred College of Rome, found no place at all. That the world had been grossly deceived by these forgeries was long ago shown by Horsley, and has since been confirmed by Wright, Kemble, Russell, and other distinguished antiquarians; yet they continue to fill the popular histories and to work their baneful influence upon the popular mind.

Bede admits that the Picts came from Scythia, whose coasts, there can be little doubt, were, centuries before his time, entirely in possession of the Norsemen. That the Picts were a Gothic race is not only evident from these circumstances, it was the opinion of Bishop Stillington, Dr. Russell, and other antiquarians. Says Dr. Russell, (1, 43,) “On attentive reflection and inquiry I am convinced, by the express authority of Bede and by other considerations, that the Picts were Scandinavian emigrants who passed from Norway into the country now called Scotland, long before the Romans visited this island, and were not of the Celtic, but of the Gothic race.”¹⁸ The passages from

¹⁸ The Orkneyinga Saga, p. 550, says that the aborigines of these islands were Picts. According to Torfæus, the isles were discovered by the Norsemen, B. C. 385, and colonized B. C. 260. In A. D. 839 the Picts of Orkney fled to Norway, and in the reign of Harold Harfaga, 865-933, they induced him to reinstate them in their native country. The Orkney and Jetland isles were possessions of the Norwegians from the ninth century down to the year 1468-9, when they were pledged by Christian I., for 58,000 Rhenish florins. Although, according to the Norwegian accounts, this debt was frequently offered to be repaid, both to the Scotch and English kings, they refused to restore the islands. The last offer was made by Frederick V., about 1750. A Scotch antiquarian says: “The possession of the Hebrides by the Norsemen must have given them great influence on the west coast.” There can be little doubt that this influence extended wherever there was water enough to float an oared barge.

Virgil and Claudian, which seem to have escaped Dr. Russell's researches, attest the soundness of his conclusions.

The inclusion of the Baltic coasts in the "Germany" of Tacitus, and their subsequent inclusion in the "Teutonic race" theories invented by ecclesiastical writers and accepted by those who have thoughtlessly followed them, is of a piece with the claims advanced by Cortes and Pizarro in America: "God gave the earth to Christ: Christ to Peter: Peter to the Pope: the Pope to Charles I., whose Lieutenant am I; therefore I advise you to lay down your arms, and to swear fealty and pay tribute to your rightful suzerain: otherwise I will despoil and destroy you!" Germany was a province of Rome, whose sovereign-pontiffs assumed the title of Germanicus. If the Saxons, Goths, Norsemen, Veneti, call them what you will, are shown to be of German descent, then they were vassals of Rome. Tacitus advances this theory in describing the scope of Germania; Charlemagne enforced it with the sword; and the Roman church, devoting centuries to the purpose, patiently worked it into the language, customs, and annals of the North. Yet there is not a grain of truth in it: the Saxons, or Northmen, and the Germans have teleologically nothing in common.

Putting together these various evidences we are warranted in asserting that the Gothic invasion or colonization of Britain took place not under the Empire, but during the Commonwealth of Rome. The ice, the cold, the long dark winters, the damp, the fogs of northern Britain had no terrors for the new-comers: they had experienced discomforts like these in the Holy Land of Norway, whence their vikings first adventured to the Jetlands. They saw only the bright side of things, the warm flood, which, coming from some unknown Paradise beyond the Western Ocean, madly raced through the North Passage and cast strange relics upon the shores of Cantyre; ¹⁹ the bright sun, which for a time scarce dips beneath the horizon; the wild heather which gaily decked the moors; the welcome summer warmth; the quick vegetation; above all, the numerous inlets and ports of the coast, delighted them; for the Norsemen were a race of sailors, accustomed to live upon the waters, and to laugh at storms. To their dull and heavy, but brave and practical minds, the land was good enough. Pytheas of Marseilles, had visited it before them, perhaps had told them something about it, how few inhabitants it possessed, how easily

¹⁹ "The Land Junction of Great Britain and Ireland," by J. C. King, pamph., 1879. Logs of wood of a kind unknown in Europe have floated to Spitzbergen. These derelicts must have suggested to the Norsemen the existence of land to the westward. Dufferin, "High Latitudes," 189.

these could be beaten off, or what rich spoils might be had on the southern downs. Of this distant portion of Albion the Norsemen of that early period probably knew little or nothing. But plunder has ever been to them a word of magic charm; so that in the course of a century or two, when their colonies in the northern country were well established and strongly fortified, it is safe to assume that they had reconnoitered the coast at least, to the Humber on the east, and the Mersey on the west, sailing up all the firths and rivers, picking up a few words of Gaelic, and capturing such spoil as fell in their way.

South of the Humber they found tribes of people greatly differing from themselves; shorter, darker, and much more civilized, or as they regarded it, richer in moveable property.²⁰ Among those natives, whom the Romans afterwards called Brigantes,²¹ were to be observed some refugees belonging to tribes of the southern coasts, whence they had been expelled recently by other refugees from Belgium. Availing themselves of the information gained by these reconnaissances, we may suppose that the Norsemen gradually advanced their settlements down the coasts, until their dominion extended to the Thames, driving the natives before them and seizing their possessions. In these conflicts they proved themselves to be inferior to the tribes previously possessed of the land in nothing but flocks and herds, and to remedy this inequality was probably among the first measures which distinguished their early polity. As for stout weapons and brawn withal to wield them, the Norsemen asked no odds of any one, whether of blue-blooded Brigante or parvenu Gael, whether from Rheims, or from Soissons.

It was whilst these adventurers, whose forefathers had sailed from Brittia and Halgaland, were picking their way southwards, that Julius Cæsar, at the head of 40,000 veteran soldiers, landed on the southern coast, and pressed northwards. Between this upper and nether millstone, as though forecasting the manner of their subsequent destruction, lay the pent-upon Gaels and Belgians.

Following these events, after the interval of a century, came the permanent, the Roman conquest of Britain. This time it was not Julius, wisely content with determining the frontiers of the empire, but Claudius, eager to celebrate a triumph and establish the worship of the emperors. The cost of forcing this religion upon Britain was the political extinction both of the ancient Gaels, the Belgian refugees, and the Iesini. Then the upper and nether millstones came

²⁰ "England is richest in moveable property of all the northern lands." *Knytlinga Saga*, c. 19.

²¹ Possibly from the biga, or chariot, which they used in battle.

together, and having no longer any native grist to grind, they ground each other.

In the Goths the Romans met foemen worthy of their steel. Other races they had divided and assimilated; the Goths were rarely divided and never wholly subdued. Their peculiar religion kept them together and upon terms with other Buddhic tribes; whilst their physical strength, numbers and maritime proficiency, rendered them difficult to master. So long as the Romans kept to the ancient policy of religious toleration, the Goths remained on the best of terms with them; and supplied them with wives, workmen, citizens, soldiers and even a few commanders. Some of these were ennobled by the Romans as Counts of the Saxon Shore.

The fiercer tribes of the Goths, the Mæataë, Picts, and Scuites, made frequent attacks upon the Roman settlements; but until the third century, although often goaded to the point of revolt, the Goths within the Walls, whom the archæological remains assure us must have formed the principal portion of the tribes subject to the Romans, remained at peace with their conquerors. The final rupture between them evidently originated in the enforcement of the official religion. The Gothic races, not only in Britain, but also in every other province in which they were established, absolutely refused to submit to hierarchical government. They were willing to obey the emperor, and might even have been taught to worship him; but to regard him as equally man and god, or both as earthly sovereign and high-priest of Heaven; to surrender not only the greatest but also the smallest of their affairs into his hands, or what was still worse, into the hands of the numerous intermediaries who had sprung up between the veiled Cæsar and his subjects; was more than Gothic common sense could grasp, or Gothic patience endure. In the third century, as though by a concerted signal, the entire Gothic race in Europe rose up in arms against a religion which they could not understand, and a government too distant to afford them either protection or redress. The Varangians of the lower Danube, the Vendians of Scythia, the Saxons of the Baltic coasts, the Menapians, and the Salian Franks of the Low Countries, the Mæataë, Picts, and Norsemen of Britain, all allied races, made a simultaneous attack upon the Roman garrisons. In the course of two or three centuries the remains of the native tribes, who had once acted as buffers between these mighty forces, were everywhere, except in southern Gaul, and Bœtica, crushed and swept out of sight.

From the dust of this conflict sprang the Four Great Nations who, between them, have achieved all the notable results of modern mari-

time discovery, and who, as a token of this naval aptitude and supremacy, to-day command both shores of the North Atlantic; the Angles, the Saxons, the Gaels, the Salian Franks, and the Normans, are all Gothic races, whose common parentage has hitherto been refused a registry, and whose common characteristics have been designedly disguised and kept out of view.

These characteristics are the capacity of great physical endurance, the love of freedom, of home, of fireside, the fear of God, an abhorrence of plotting, mystery, or subterfuge, and a passionate instinct for the sea. Upon this Gothic foundation their social life has reared an edifice, whose materials, forged in the civil conflicts of the ancient Roman Republic, but buried for centuries by the Roman Hierarchy, were at length recovered and employed in the construction of the Western kingdoms. These materials are Constitutional Government, Supremacy of the Law, the Right of Assemblage, Representation in the Comitia, Trial by Jury, and the Restriction of the Church to spiritual affairs. All these and other institutions of freedom, for the most part unknown to the Goths in their tribal state, were by them resurrected from the ancient Commonwealth of Rome and implanted in the early charters of France and England.

“The Norsemen deified the Sea-tempest and called it *Aegir*, a very dangerous Jötun and now, to this day, on the river Trent, the Nottingham bargemen when the river is in a certain flooded state call it *Eager*; they cry out, ‘Have a care, there is the Eager coming!’ Curious; that word surviving, like the peak of a submerged world! The oldest Nottingham bargemen had believed in the god Aegir. Indeed, our English blood, in good part, is Norse, or, rather at bottom, Norse and Saxon have no distinction. * * * All over our Island we are mingled with Danes * * * in greater proportion along the East Coast, and greatest of all, as I find, in the North Country. From the Humber upwards, all over Scotland, the speech of the common people is still, in a singular degree, Icelandic.”²²

²² Thomas Carlyle, “Hero Worship.”

CHAPTER II.

THE ROMAN CONQUEST OF BRITAIN.

Conquest and settlement—Formation of a Romano-Gothic race—Reasons why the history of Roman Britain is commonly slurred over or suppressed—Division of the lands of Britain—Estates granted—Treatment of the Norse and Gælic natives—Quasi-feudal fiefs—Ecclesiastical lands—Benefices—Mining—Opulence of Roman Britain—High state of civilization—Roads—Fisheries—Drainage of the Fens—River dikes—Industrial establishments—Fortresses, villas, basilicæ, temples, and other public works—Security of life—Diversity of industries—Commerce—Corn trade—Money—Irritating restrictions imposed at Rome—Trades and trade guilds—Merchants—Bankers—Learned Professions—Church—Law—Medicine—Navigation—Astronomy—Fine Arts.

IN another place reasons will be given for believing that the Romans remained in possession of some portions of Britain until a much later period than is commonly supposed. For the present it will be sufficient to recall the commonly accepted belief that the legions held control of Britain from the reign of Claudius to nearly the middle of the fifth century, that is to say, for upwards of four hundred years. This control was substantially unbroken and continuous. It extended over the entire island from sea to sea, and from the Channel northwards to the prodigious line of fortifications and battlements known anciently as the Outer Wall and now as Graham's Dyke. Within this area the Romans established a provincial state whose inhabitants differed from those of the mother country chiefly in the important respect that each successive generation was recruited from fresh stock, the result of marriages between Roman soldiers drawn from every country in Europe and women who were always, or nearly always, of Norse descent. The product of these unions was a provincial race, which as time went on became more and more Gothic and less and less Roman; so that at the period when, according to the monkish chronicles, Britain was suddenly snatched from the Romans by unconnected bands of barbarian Goths from Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein, the province was already filled with a Gothic race which was not barbarian but civilized and which possessed all the advantages of walls, castles, fortifications, arms, equipment, commissariat, discipline, superior

numbers, and unity of purpose. The shriek of despair which the chroniclers have transmitted to us from this period is probably one of those rhetorical touches which characterizes all fabulous or semi-fabulous history.

The Roman government of Britain having lasted at least four centuries, why is it that this period is usually disposed of by modern writers in the fewest lines and that in some historical works it is scarcely mentioned at all? The museums and antiquarian collections are full of objects belonging to it. Is it for lack of interest in the events of the period? They are the most significant, the most instructive, the most important events that ever happened to the country previous to the thirteenth century. No. The true reason is that any examination of this period which is not entirely superficial discloses facts to publish which would jeopardize the popularity of the book that mentioned them. It comes to this then, the truth having been rendered incredible, unpopular and unprofitable—therefore let us continue to suppress it.

But, as Polybius long since remarked, history which is not founded upon the truth is an idle tale that may serve to entertain or amuse, but not to guide or instruct. Such history is now out of date. The world is moving on. New political situations occur every day. We want actual events, pictures of actual life, actual thoughts, actual passions—in a word, experience—to pilot us. In place of this we have been offered little else than cloister tales made readable by modern art: medieval mendacity perpetuated by historical romances.

With the conquest of Britain by Claudius, the circle of the Roman hierarchy was completed. It embraced all the ancient hierarchies of the Occident—Persia, Assyria, Egypt, Greece, Etruria, and Gaul. Outside of this circle there appeared to be no organized state west of the Indies; only predatory and wandering tribes, attached to no particular soil and united by no general polity. In these and many other respects the wanderers closely resembled the northern Indians and the relations which the latter bore to the European colonies of America. Passionately fond of freedom, brave, strong, fierce, cunning, warlike, and inured to every species of danger and privation, they were nevertheless no match for disciplined men, abundantly provided with arms, food, and the resources of civilization; and in the end the Indians succumbed. So with the so-called barbarians of Europe. Barring a few engagements at long intervals, in which the Romans suffered defeat, the latter rarely had any serious difficulty to repel the tribes who dwelt beyond the Rhine, the Danube, and the

Outer Wall of Britain. We shall deal in another place with the so-called barbarian invasions of the fifth century; meanwhile what is desired to be conveyed is that no fears of barbarian conquest prevented the Romans during their occupation of Britain from freely expending upon the improvement or embellishment of that island, its numerous cities, ports, commercial centres, roads, arteries, and channels of communication, all the capital, art, and labour they had at command, and for which employment could be found.

In fact the antiquarian remains prove that, after a brief initial period of conquest and settlement, Britain acquired all those elements of civilization and progress which distinguished the mother country at the same period. Martial boasted that no sooner did the legions conquer Britain than Roman civilization, institutes, and literature filled the places which their swords had made vacant, and Juvenal, that even the learning and eloquence of Rome was extended to that distant province. When the neglect of modern historians in respect of these details is borne in mind, the reader may perhaps not unwillingly listen to some of the most notable results of the Roman conquest of Britain.

Previous to this event, Britain was little more than a desert. The island, for the most part, consisted of forest, moor, and fen; the clearings were few, mostly upon the southern coasts, whose inhabitants had learnt, through intercourse with the Phœnician, Carthaginian, and Greek traders, some rudimentary arts of civilized life. The rivers, winding through a rich soil and without the restraint of dykes, were bordered by extensive marshes, which rendered them difficult to cross and useless for transportation, or commerce. The products of the soil were limited to the natural grasses upon which the cattle were fed, and to a scanty crop of corn. Add to these resources the wild coster, plum, and several sorts of berries and nuts, and we have an almost complete inventory of all that the land yielded to support human life. The numerous fruits and vegetables and commercial plants which now grow with so much luxuriance, were nearly all introduced by the Romans; the peach, apricot, and pear from Asia; the vine, cherry, and currant from Greece; the apple, gooseberry, and chestnut from Italy; the walnut from Gaul.

There are reasons to believe that in the settlement of Britain, those native chieftains who evinced a willingness to live under Roman laws were granted something like feudal fiefs, which were to last during the lifetime of the incumbent or else during that of the sovereign-pontiff of Rome and renewable at death. Such appears to have been the nature of the estates granted by Claudius to Prasutagus and Cogi-

danus.¹ An inscription discovered at Chichester proves that Cogidanus, for one, ruled as Legatus Augustus,² and it is more than likely that Prasutagus also ruled with the same vicarious title and powers.

The natives who proved less tractable were either driven off or reduced to vassalage and their lands seized and engrossed by the fisc, or sovereign-pontifical treasury, which, after appropriating a specified portion of them to the service of the local temples, leased out the remainder to the veteran troops or to Roman colonists, both of whom, under the conditions common to such fiefs, were liable to military service.³ As we shall see farther on, these estates were afterwards subjected to the management of the proconsuls, to whom, instead of to the sovereign-pontiff, as formerly, the rents and military service became due.

The lands donated to the temples were also leased out, because since they had become the property of the gods, they could not be sold. As the ecclesiastical profession enjoyed the benefit (*beneficio*) of exemption from military service, these lands were much sought after by those who preferred a peaceful to a military life. We have here all the materials of a feudal land system. Most of these arrangements were made between the reigns of Claudius and Caracalla. In Mr. Coote's interesting work, the system of surveying, allotting and marking off the lands by stone monuments are all clearly and accurately portrayed. Agriculture was pursued so systematically that in Gaul the Romans used machine-mowers drawn by two horses, and it can scarcely be doubted that implements equally perfect were employed in Britain.⁴

Next in importance to the surface rights were those which related to mines. Besides "streaming" for tin in Cornwall and working some small alluvial "washings" for gold in the mountain-basins and river-valleys of Wales, there are no evidences of any mining in Britain previous to the Roman settlement. Then, suddenly, the whole island seems to have been ransacked for metals. Subterranean mines of gold, silver, silver-lead, silver-zinc, tin, copper, iron, lead, coal,⁵ and jet, were opened in all directions and attacked with an energy and success which it is difficult to measure without visiting the immense dumps, heaps of debris and other remains left behind, some of which, as in the case of the iron ore refuse heaps at Kangie, have been reworked

¹ Tacitus, *Agric.*, XIV.

² Horsley, *Brit. Rom.*, 332.

³ Sir Francis Palgrave, "*Eng. Com.*," I, 351, supports the feudal view herein taken.

⁴ Pliny, XVIII, 30; Columella, II, 21.

⁵ The Romans worked coal mines at North Benwell and other places in the Tyne valley.

in modern times. Quarries of chalk and building-stone, lime-kilns, brick, tile, and pottery works, were established in almost every neighborhood which has since been utilized for similar industries. Within eighty years of its conquest distant Britain was important enough to merit a ceremonious visit from the divine Hadrian; and sufficiently opulent to sustain a vast local expenditure for roads, temples, fortifications, drainage-works, river-embankments, ports, light-houses and fleets.

Rome, like the hub of a wheel which covered Europe, western Asia, and northern Africa, was the centre of a system of highways that extended to the confines of civilization. These were lined with guard and posting-houses, provided with relays of horses ready for immediate service, and patrolled by rural policemen. The highway that ended at Boulogne was continued at Dover and went beyond York, crossing the North Tyne by a stone bridge whose magnificent abutments were only laid bare to the antiquarian a third of a century back. Branching from this great highway were numerous others, which penetrated to all parts of Britain. These roads are still in use and upon some of them yet stand the original milestones planted there seventeen centuries ago.

If we turn from the land to the sea we shall find similar marks of Roman industry and enterprise. There is not a branch of fishing which was not prosecuted. A Roman harpoon has been found in the skeleton of a whale 25 feet above the highest tides of the Forth, ⁶ a proof that the animal met its death when the sea rose to the level indicated by the ruins of the Roman quay at Cramond.⁷ Native oysters of Rutupiæ or Richborough were packed in baskets and sent to Rome, where, as Juvenal tells us, they took high rank among the bivalves favoured by Italian epicures.⁸ The cod, ling, salmon and herring fisheries were all pursued on a large scale. Nothing escaped the Roman fisc. Even the size of the ox-hides received for taxes was narrowly scrutinized.⁹

Extensive remains of draining works in the Lincolnshire fens have

⁶ Scarth, 18.

⁷ The Roman quay at Cramond (the Roman Alaterna) is 24 $\frac{1}{2}$ feet, in one place 26 $\frac{1}{2}$ feet, above sea level. This is due to a gradual geological upheaval of the country, which has gone on from time immemorial and is still going on at an accelerated rate. For many centuries previous to 1810 the annual vertical movement was about one-fifth of an inch; since that date it has amounted to one-half of an inch. These measurements have been ascertained from two interesting facts—first, the wall of Antoninus, originally carried to the sea-level, now comes to an end at a point 26 feet above high tide (Emil Reclus); second, the position of the skeleton of a whale, mentioned in the text.

⁸ Satires, IV, line 141.

⁹ Tacitus, Annals, LXXII.

rewarded the search of antiquarians.¹⁰ The prosecution of these works by the Romans evince the scarcity and high value of farm-lands, which again attest the large area already under culture and the amplitude of the agricultural product. River embankments known to be Roman, to-day line the shores and help to confine the waters of the Thames, Ouse and other streams. Mills, smelting-furnaces, forges, smithies, machine-shops, armouries and industrial works of various kinds, arose on all sides. Around these works grew villas, towns and cities, many of the former, in a more or less ruined condition, still surviving. Within the cities were erected citadels, temples, basilicæ, fountains, baths, pavements, sewers, statues, shrines and other public works of use or embellishment. In short, as Mr. Kendrick says of Roman York, "The antiquities comprehend all the apparatus of a civilized and even luxurious life; and show that side by side with the troops of the garrison, an industrious and wealthy population had formed itself."

It is important to observe that the Romans who went to Britain were not obliged to resign themselves to a life in the bush. Britain was but little like the other provinces. Its inhabitants were more secure from the vicissitudes of war than those nearer the capital; they were surrounded with similar conveniences, advantages and opportunities; they were governed by the same laws and could appeal to the same gods. The visitor who saunters through a British museum of antiquities cannot fail to be impressed with the immense number and variety of objects made of every possible material, such as gold, silver, copper, lead, iron, steel, brass, bronze, tin, wood, ivory, tortoise-shell, mother-of-pearl, horn, bone, jet, stone, glass, clay, terra-cotta, wool, silk, flax, hemp, leather, and feathers. Many of these articles, especially the smaller ones, may have been made in Italy or Gaul; most of them must have been made in Britain. Look at the remains of the magnificent temples, basilicæ, theatres, and baths, at York, Silchester, Lincoln, Wroxeter, Bath, St. Albans, and Chichester. These stones were evidently cut in Britain, they evince not only skill and taste, but also the employment of capital wherewith to purchase the materials and pay the artists and labourers who cut them. Villas with ten to forty apartments, the roofs covered with copper-plate or sheet-lead, the court-yards decorated with fountains and pictures, the interiors warmed with hypocausts, the whole drained by spacious sewers, have been found in many places, for example, at Lincoln, Wroxeter, Cor-

¹⁰ "Our bodies are worn out in clearing woods and draining marshes." *Galcagus to the Caledonians*. Tac., *Agric.*, xxxi.

lingham, Chetworth, Thorpe, Silchester, Cirencester and Bignor. All these works must have been the product of provincial skill or industry.

The Romans could hardly have failed to discover the advantages which the humid climate of Britain afforded in the spinning of such textiles as wool and silk. Woolen-mills were worked at Winchester and at all other places that possessed available water powers; and it is not too much to suppose that the texture made of these materials, which Pliny mentions under the name of *bombacinē* and which still goes by that name, was largely made in Britain. Certain comparatively obscure products must alone have been sufficient to employ a large number of workmen. In the recesses of the Mendip Hills remains have been found which indicate that, as, in America, at the present time, the mines were lighted with candles. Mining was conducted upon so extensive a scale in Roman Britain that the manufacture of candles must have formed no small industry. Beer was then as now, the chief beverage of the workmen. The breweries must therefore have been numerous and important. Remains of tasselled pavements and mosaic works have been found in such quantities as to bespeak a body of artists and an organized industry, of no mean magnitude.

The foreign commerce of provincial Britain, though for a long period carried exclusively in Roman bottoms, was of great dimensions. It extended to Ireland, Gaul, Spain, and Italy, on the one side; and to Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Zealand, on the other. Romano-British remains have been found in all these places. In the reign of Augustus a Roman fleet visited the principal parts of the North and Baltic seas, and not improbably collected the information which furnished the ground-work for the "Germania" of Tacitus. The chief commerce of Roman-Britain was of course with the mother country, and much of this was conducted overland through Gaul by way of Boulogne or Calais and Marseilles. The exports of Britain were chiefly tin, gold, silver, jet-goods, pearls, lead, chalk, timber, masts and spars for ships, corn, hides, peltries, dried-fish, oysters and hunting-dogs, of which last, Britain produced a race much esteemed in Rome. The imports consisted of gold coins, bronze "S C" money, salt, silk, fine pottery, bronze weapons, tools, implements, utensils, ornaments, and trinkets, ivory and other fancy goods, steel weapons and cutlery, works of art, plants, seeds, wines, and dried fruits.

The details of this trade doubtless greatly varied from time to time. Many commodities, especially those made of bronze or copper, which at first were wholly imported, appear to have been afterward manu-

factured in Britain and eventually became profitable to export. Such seems to have been the case with glass and glasswares. During the first centuries of the Roman establishment in Britain it is probable that the imperial fisc managed to carry out its colonial policy pretty rigidly, and this was to monopolize the supply of manufactures for the province. After that time, the province appears to have gained some commercial freedom, only to lose it again at a subsequent period. The exports of gold from Britain were comparatively small, and after the alluvions were exhausted they rapidly diminished. Those of pearls were never important. The corn trade grew to such considerable dimensions that in the reign of Julian the Roman troops on the continent were supplied with no less than eight hundred cargoes of grain from Britain, in a single season. The size of the ships employed in this trade can only be conjectured. Zosimus, (lib. iii,) informs us that they were larger than common barks.

Edicts were issued by Augustus and Claudius, and probably by all the sovereign-pontiffs of Rome, which forbade any kind of bronze money from being used in the provinces, except that which was struck by the government at Rome. As such money formed the commonest medium of exchange, this regulation must have had a powerful influence upon the affairs of Britain. This subject will be discussed in another place. During the sixteenth century similar restraints were imposed by the Spanish government upon the colonies in Mexico and Central and South America. This unwise example was afterwards followed by Great Britain with reference to its colonies in North America, a policy that led to the establishment of unlawful banks, unlawful mints, and the coinage of Pine-tree shillings. Efforts of the Crown to suppress these establishments first gave birth to that popular irritation and defiance of the royal authority in Massachusetts, which eventuated in the Outbreak of 1775.¹¹ What followed the adoption of this policy in Roman Britain does not appear from any extant texts; we only know that about A. D. 280 there was a revolt and (for the first time) a provincial mint.

The industrial classes of the Romans in Britain embraced farmers, herdsmen, clerks, merchants, manufacturers, miners, tradesmen, mechanics, labourers, fishermen, carriers, publicans, apothecaries, porters, stevedores, marketmen, hucksters, shipbuilders, sailors, and others. Barbers, bathers, and domestic servants, were very numerous. The

¹¹ This policy is now abandoned. Local mints exist in both India and Australia. Nevertheless, through the operation of the Acts of 1666 and 1812, the control of the monetary system still remains with the mercantile community of London. On this subject consult the author's "History of Money in America."

merchants seem to have been specialized almost as much as they are at the present day, except perhaps in very large cities. For example, in 1647, a Roman votive altar was discovered near Domburg, in Zealand, which had been erected by Silvanus Secundus, evidently a Roman citizen of Gothic descent, who described himself as a "Brittian chalk merchant."¹²

Next in social importance to the merchants, and in later and more degenerate times, before them, ranked the money-brokers, who exchanged the over-valued "S C" bronze money minted in Rome and used in Britain, for the gold and silver bullion intended for export, or the gold and silver coins employed in commerce. There was a banking class in Rome, but it was probably absorbed by the Pontificate before Britain was permanently settled. A governmental Monetary Commission, consisting of three bankers, was formed so early as B.C. 218. Six years later, a fire which broke out near the Forum, destroyed several banking-houses. In the reign of Augustus certain of these institutions were called the New Banks. In that of Tiberius a monetary stringency resulted in the establishment of a pontifical bank with a capital of one hundred thousand great sesterces and power to lend money on the security of lands worth double the sum loaned. After this time we hear no more of banks until the fall of the Sacred empire in 1204. During the intervening centuries the monetary system of the empire was substantially in the hands of the sovereign-pontiff; who thus became the Sole banker of Europe. The sacred character which the Roman religion attached to gold, enabled the Sacred emperor to preserve this and a few other regalian rights from being exercised by the pro-consuls or feudal princes, and in his palsied hands they remained until the last.

The learned professions in Britain included the church—that is to say, bishops, curates, augurs, clerks, monks, and other ecclesiastics—the law, medicine, surgery, the army, the navy, astronomy, astrology, pedagogy, natural sciences, civil and mining engineering, architecture, literature, sculpture, painting, music, engraving, die-sinking, lapidary-work, the drama, oratory, and other avocations. The Roman law was too ample, intricate, and refined to be administered without the aid of a regularly constituted bench, and a faculty of advocates, students, notaries, and other officials; and these may therefore be safely included among the professions practised in Britain. Papinian, one of the ablest lawyers of Rome, was in the train of Septimius Severus, and

¹² Wright's "Celt, Roman, and Saxon." Mr. Wright has translated "Brittian" as "British," but both Prof. de Vit's exposition and the fact that the altar relates to the arrival of a cargo of chalk prove that it relates to Brittia, or Jutland, and not to Britain.

he officiated as advisor to the emperor's son, Geta. During the absence of the emperor in North Britain, Geta acted as Legate at York, where Papinian is believed to have founded a law university; for there lingered in that capital a school of Roman law in 639, which we hear of again in 804. Papinian's university, if it ever existed, must have soon dropped into ecclesiastical hands, and from an university fallen to the rank of a canonical college. Even during the interval when Britain freed itself from the dominion of Rome, the ancient laws prevailed, only now they were modified and administered by local authorities. When christianity was introduced, the Roman authority and the Roman laws were restored and made permanent. That these laws afforded to the citizen, if not liberty, at least an ample measure of security, is the opinion of Mr. Coote, himself a lawyer and a close student of the Roman antiquities of Britain.

Medicine has left memorials at Colchester, where Doctor Hermogenes has perpetuated his name and title upon an altar, and at Housesteads, in Northumbria, where a monumental stone commemorates a young medical practitioner named Anicius. Navigation is evidenced not only by the fact that a regular commerce was carried on in sailing-vessels with the Baltic and Mediterranean ports, but also by the circumstance that Æsclepiodotus, a military præfect and naval lieutenant under Constantius, conducted his fleet from Iessoriacum (Boulogne) to Britain, in a storm, and with a side wind: thus proving that ships at that time could sail on a bow-line. This is a refinement in navigation which at a later period the Norsemen copied from the Romans. Meanwhile, whenever the wind was not aft, the early Norse navigators were obliged to use their sweeps as a means of propulsion. Mr. Coote claims that many of the nautical terms in use at the present day had a Roman origin; an opinion to which Roman proficiency in navigation lends great plausibility.

Astronomy was cultivated with much assiduity by the learned classes of Rome and her provinces. They were the inheritors of the entire body of Oriental and Greek learning on this subject. Thales had demonstrated the sphericity of the earth; Pythagoras had calculated its motions; Meton had his name attached to the Indian cycle, which was employed to foretell eclipses; Eratosthenes, by actually measuring the arc of a meridian, determined the circumference of the earth at 252,000 stadii, or about 28,000 English miles; Strabo alluded to its sphericity as a well-known fact; and Pliny, whose Natural History must have been in the library of every cultivated person in Britain, said: "I do not suppose that the land is actually wanting, nor that

the earth has not the form of a globe, but that on each side, the uninhabitable parts have not yet been discovered." The work of Ptolemy the Younger also maintained that the earth was spherical. Indeed, ages before this time, Herodotus had remarked that the sphericity of the earth was a belief derived from astronomical observation, which was yet to be verified by an actual voyage.¹³ If the Romans did not make such a voyage, they nevertheless coasted along the south of Asia to Ceylon, and the north of Europe to the vicinity of Bergen; whilst they coasted the shores of eastern Africa as far south as the Mozambique. They also bequeathed to the Norsemen the belief in sphericity, as well as the practical art of sailing on a bow-line; and the latter, by the aid of both the belief and the invention, crossed the Atlantic ocean and discovered Greenland and America. Says the *Ynglinga Saga*, a work of the ninth century: "The round of the earth on which men dwell is much cut by the sea, large seas stretch from the outer sea round the earth, into the land."¹⁴

That intoxication of religious belief which enabled a Greek or an Italian to worship images, provided their names and attributes were changed to suit the prevailing mythology, seems to have been entirely foreign to the provincials of Britain. There, the large admixture of Norse blood kept the people sober, and when emperor-worship and other paganisms came to an end, nearly everything was destroyed which perpetuated the ancient idolatries. Hence the few sculptures or castings that remain. Among these must be included the fine bronze head of Hadrian recovered from the Thames and now in the British Museum. The statues of the other gods were destroyed, broken to pieces, melted down, or cast into the rivers. The Mithraic monuments at York and Newcastle are chiefly of the third century, which is probably also the æra of the Mithraic cave at Barcovicus. Their rudeness proves that they were not sculptured for the established church of that period, but for the people.¹⁵

¹³ Herodotus, *Melpomene*, 8.

¹⁴ *Ynglinga Saga*, chap. 1. In the twelfth century the Norsemen erected the following remarkable monument on the western shores of the Atlantic ocean. It was a stone slab, found in 1824, on the island of Kingiktorsoak, in Baffin's Bay, latitude 72 degrees 54 seconds, longitude 56 degrees west of Greenwich, the inscription being in runes:

ELLIGR · SIGVATHS · SON : R · OK · BJANNI : TORTARSON:
OK : ENRITHI · ODDSSON : LAUKARDAK · IN : FYRIR GAKNDAG
HLOTHV · VARDATE · OK RYDU : MCXXXV.

"Erling Sighvatsson and Bjarni Thordasson and Eindrid Oddsson on Laugarday, (another name for Saturday) before Gangday, raised these marks and cleared the ground, 1135" (Bishop Percy's *Supplement to Mallet's "Northern Antiquities,"* p. 248).

¹⁵ See the altars to these gods in the Catalogue of the Blackgate Museum, at Newcastle.

CHAPTER III.

LANGUAGE, LAWS, GOVERNMENT, RELIGION.

Universality of the Roman language—Of the Civil Law—Of the ancient religion and government—These were impersonal institutes under the Commonwealth—They became personal and local ones under the empire—Yet long after the establishment of the empire the ancient influences prevailed—Example from the tenure of lands—The empire introduced feudalism—Yet feudalism did not assume characteristic forms until near the period of the Gothic revolts—Same with the Augustan religion—Reason why Romano-British antiquities evince artistic degeneration—No evidences of degeneration in the social state of Britain—Moral attributes of the Romano-British—No archæological evidences of christianity in Britain during the Roman æra.

THE Roman language was one and wherever the legions penetrated, the native tongues soon fell into disuse and gave place to the sonorous and flexible speech of the conquerors. When, centuries later, the Roman towns were governed by provincial Gothic chieftains, language afforded to the vanquished imperialists a refuge which their ramparts had denied. The conflict of tongues, though fierce at first, soon resulted in grinding to pieces the Gothic upon the polished surface of the Latin; and the English of to-day at once attests and measures the supremacy of the latter.¹

The Roman law was one, and it prevailed over the whole empire. It was embalmed in written codes of high antiquity and gradual growth, the result of many ages of practical experience and refinement in the administration of justice. It was open to all, it proclaimed the rights of all, it refused protection to none.² It not only defined the rights of Romans, it determined the relations between Romans and others; and thus, except in strictly local cases, it concerned the entire population of the empire.

¹ Because the Gothic words ox, sheep, and calf express live animals, and the Latin words beef, mutton, and veal express dead ones, the pitiful inference has been made of virility in one language, and of poverty and exhaustion in the other. But this is so far from being true that the Gothic language, in its barrenness, had no words to distinguish the flesh of these animals from their living bodies, whilst the Latin language, in its ample wealth, had both. See De Quincey, XIV, 151, as to the great value of our Roman inheritance of language.

² "It granted equal rights to all, and closed against none the path of honourable ambition." Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 370.

At the period of the provincial revolts in Britain, the Roman law was pagan, it consisted of ancient acts of the Comitia or of the Senate, or of both combined, of imperial ordinances and rescripts, of ecclesiastical regulations,³ of the equity of the prætors, and of other juridical materials. The amplitude and complexity of this vast body of law unfitted it for use by the provincials. After an abortive attempt to rule the provinces by means of the mixed codes that had grown up since their conquest, Theodosius met their wants more fitly by promulgating a simpler code, which they utilized for the basis of their subsequent legislation. However, this too gave way at last to the older Roman law.

Whilst the Roman language and the civil law were the same in all parts of the empire, the Roman imperial religion gave rise to a degree of discontent which was unknown to the polytheistic religions of the Commonwealth. Whilst the language and the civil law were impersonal and the circuit courts carried the administration of the latter into every corner of the Roman world, the imperial canon law was essentially personal and local. It emanated from, and centered in, the city of Rome; it bound the people, not by mutual obligations to each other in all places, but in fealty and service to the sovereign-pontiff at Rome; it permitted the worship of ancient gods and local deities, but only in the manner and with the ritual prescribed at Rome. The Latin language and the civil law were of the highest antiquity, they came from the Commonwealth. The imperial government was a new establishment, and the canon law was greatly altered after the apotheoses of Julius Cæsar and Augustus. The former arose from the people, belonged to the people, and kept the people together; the latter arose from the sovereign-pontiff, belonged to the sovereign-pontiff, and kept the people apart. Before the creation of the hierarchical empire, the citizen consulted the laws to ascertain the rights he possessed and the obligations he owed to his fellowmen; after the establishment of the empire he needed only to study those that affected his relations to the long line of suzerains which ascended to and ended with the sovereign-pontiff.

Yet, so slow is the march of innovation, that several centuries elapsed after the Roman constitution was changed by Julius Cæsar, before

³ The Roman canon law, even after the expulsion of the kings, largely trenched upon the Civil Code, through its hold upon the Code of Procedure and the pontifical control of the calendar. All this was broken down in A. U. 449 by the curule ædile Caius Flavius, whose name should ever be held in veneration by the lovers of freedom. Livy, ix, 46. But what was gained for the popular cause by Caius Flavius was lost again when Julius Cæsar crushed the liberties of the Roman world.

the influence of its old republican legislation was entirely lost. Take, for example, the feudal system. It can be shown that this must necessarily have begun its growth on the day that Julius Cæsar was apotheosized; feudalism and hierarchical government being essentially related. Proconsular government, vicarious government, renewable kingships or dukedoms, telescopic or involved castes of nobility, tenures of land other than complete ownership, tenures on condition of performing military or other service to any other person than the Head of the State—all these are feudal, they are the necessary consequence of hierarchical government, and have followed it wherever it has been established; whether in Roman Europe, Brahminical Hindostan, or Aboriginal Mexico. Josephus has transmitted to us the texts of several charters granted by Julius Cæsar himself, which are essentially and undeniably feudal.⁴ Why, then, if feudalism was established with the hierarchy, did it not immediately develope into that matured and complex system which it became after the provincial revolts, and while yet many cities in Italy, Spain, Gaul and Britain remained in imperial Roman hands? Because of the influence of the ancient Commonwealth, whose laws and customs, despite the hierarchy, still maintained a secret hold upon, not merely the people, but their rulers, as well.

It was the same with religion. The most ancient religion of Rome had for its core the worship of ancestors. Around this in time had clustered the religious myths of every race that Rome admitted into her composite structure. Prominent among these were the Greek anthropomorphic conceptions of the Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercury, Jove, Venus, Saturn, Earth and other heavenly bodies.⁵ Beneath all lay hidden the subtle myths of Brahma and Buddha. Horsley gives a list of above one hundred and fifty minor deities to whom votive offerings were made in Britain and made in much the same way that similar offerings were afterwards made to the myriad saints of a later mythology. Indeed what the Romans meant by a minor god was very like what the medieval Christians meant by a "saint." Horsley says nothing about the worship of those ancestral images, nor of the images of their emperors, to whom the pious were taught to address their vows; perhaps because being commonly made of wax, they did not strictly come within the scope of "antiquities." Yet, within a few miles of where this antiquarian composed his great work, he might have observed a striking instance of the persistency of religious cus-

⁴ Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIV, 10.

⁵ Uranus was not discovered (known as such) until 1781, nor Neptune until 1846.

toms. In an obscure chamber of Westminster Abbey were grouped together a series of royal images in wax, which although of course not worshipped, were made in pursuance of that ancient Roman custom, which religion had once enjoined and which, wherever the Roman religion had prevailed, had probably never fallen into disuse. In that chamber they remain to this day.⁶

The religion established by Julius Cæsar and afterwards by Augustus, was the worship of himself, as the son of God. Temples were erected to it in all parts of the empire; a vast body of priests and other officers were appointed to perpetuate its rites; innumerable benefices of lands were granted to its temples: immense sums of money were devoted to its support; and the *lex crimen majestatis* was employed to enforce its observances, and punish heretics. Yet in time it all fell so dead and flat beneath the contempt of the intellectual classes and the inveteracy of ancient custom, that only the lowest classes of Rome, the rabble, the pot-lickers, the corn-beggars, the dead-heads of the circus, could be depended upon for constancy to the new and repulsive creed; and even these classes, in the course of a few generations, had to have the nauseous dose sweetened by the worship of Julius Cæsar, through Venus, and of Augustus, through Maia, his pretended mother. We find Tacitus, who was a priest of the Sacred College and therefore sworn to the maintenance of the Julian and Augustan worship, holding in fact to the ancient worship of Jupiter; Pliny swearing by Hercules; and Juvenal scoffing at both.⁷ The better classes of Rome no more adopted emperor-worship than did the Jews, who would not have it in Palestine, nor the Ieseni under Boadicea, who marched to a certain death, rather than yield support to its hated temples in Britain. We shall find this provincial hostility to emperor-worship of the highest importance in restoring the effaced outlines of early British history.

The civil liberties of the Romans had begun to decline before the legions improved and fortified Britain; hence many of the extant Roman antiquities evince artistic degeneration; for art cannot survive the decay of liberty. Yet so slow was the progress of such degeneracy

⁶ Dean Stanley.

⁷ "Hearest thou these things, O Jupiter, as if indeed thou wert made of bronze or marble? As for thy effigies, I can perceive no difference between them and the statue of Bathyllus the Musician." *Juv., Sat., XIII, 114.* "Our home-bred ancestors knew no better. Formerly there was no carousing among the gods, no Ganymede, nor Hebe to be cup-bearer; while Vulcan, not yet feigned to quaff celestial nectar, scoured from his arms the black marks of his Liparan forge. Each god then dined alone, and the present rout of divinities had no existence." *Juv., Sat., XII, 40.*

that for more than a century after the Roman conquest, few or no evidences of it are to be observed. The arts continued to flourish, life and property remained secure, the burdens imposed by the state do not appear to have occasioned any outcry or remonstrance, and but few irksome monopolies of trade existed. The metallic tribute demanded from Britain, was more than supplied by the produce of her native mines, and both education and numerous social and industrial opportunities were open to every citizen, regardless of race or religion. Decay is first observable in the monuments of the second century.

The pitiless mendacity of bigots has almost deprived the Romans of moral character. Whether of Italy or Britain, they have rendered the name of Roman pagan, synonymous with everything that is vile. The bitter invectives of Juvenal, unmistakingly aimed at the abominations of the capital, these bigots have applied to distant London and York, which probably barely heard of them. In this manner they have blurred and falsified all the lines of history. But no unprejudiced person can read the fond and affecting inscriptions upon the ancient tombs and altars of Britain, without giving the provincial Romans credit for as much truth, love, and piety, as are to be gleaned from similar evidences of our own times. Mr. Wright publishes a great number of these inscriptions, and the student who wishes to derive from original proofs a just estimate of Romano-British character, must read them for himself. Whatever may have been its rites, customs, or ceremonies, the monuments of Britain indicate that, in practice, the Roman religions promoted the observance of as much tenderness, filial affection, benevolence, pity, charity, decency, and sobriety, as are known to prevail in the same places at the present day. There, indeed, came a time when all these moral traits grew fainter, and the social bond itself was dissolved; but this appears to have been no more caused by the ancient beliefs, than the brutality and depravity of the middle ages were caused by christianity.

The names found upon the tombs and other remains of the Romans and provincials, afford, when rightly studied, a valuable guide in tracing the decline and extinction of liberty and its subsequent restoration after the Fall of the Eastern empire. The Roman ingenui, or free-born, had three several names, the *prænomen*, *nomen*, and *cognomen*.⁸ The *prænomen*, or given name, was conferred, as now, by the priesthood, upon the nomination of the parents. The *nomen*, or patronymic, was the name of the gens, tribe, or clan, to which the person belonged.

⁸ Adams, "Roman Antiquities."

The cognomen, surname, or family name, was hereditary. Slaves had no family names. Both they and their children, together with whatever they possessed, belonged to their owners; slaves could transmit nothing, not even a name. Under the Commonwealth, they were commonly called after their masters. Under the empire, they were sometimes called after their country, as Danicus, Syrius, or Tagus; and sometimes by capricious or even derisive names. When manumitted, they commonly took the nomen of their masters, but not the cognomen. Upon the early Roman remains of Britain the occurrence of three names upon a tombstone is quite common; upon the later remains there are seldom more than two; and frequently but one name. From the establishment of the Medieval empire under Charlemagne to the Fall of Constantinople in the thirteenth century, the great mass of the people of Britain had no family names; a sure indication of their servile condition.

Notwithstanding the many volumes that have been written on the subject, and in which the prevalence or practice of christianity during the occupation of Britain by the Roman legions is assumed, no valid evidences have been adduced in its support. No temple, no altar, no tombstone, no inscription, no book, no mark, no symbol of any kind, has yet been found which contains any certain evidence of, or allusion to, christianity. The Romans entered Britain both before and after the beginning of our æra. They came not only from Rome and Byzantium, but also from numerous other parts of the empire. The temples and tombstones of the Romans, their altars, graves, personal relics, coins, furniture, decorations, all prove that christianity was unknown. Down to the moment when the troops departed from Britain, the people offered sacrifices and inscribed their last pious wishes to Jupiter, Bacchus, Serapis, or Mithra, gods who had been worshipped from very ancient times. The degrading worship of emperors had fallen into disuetude. Sir Francis Palgrave, after a careful examination of all the literary materials bearing upon the subject, finds no valid evidence that the British tribes ever heard of christianity. The earliest evidences of christianity in Britain relate to the romanized Britons, chiefly of the higher ranks, and (he might have added) therefore those to whom the official religion of emperor-worship was most repugnant.⁹

The Rev. Dr. Bruce sums up the case in a few words.¹⁰ After admitting the absence of any Christian memorials in the Roman remains he says: "We meet the cross in several of its forms, but it is admitted on all hands that the cross and even the famed cipher P^* or X P are

⁹Palgrave's "English Commonwealth," I, 154. ¹⁰Bruce, "The Roman Wall," p. 11.

emblems older than christianity. Their appearance on monuments prior to the time of Constantine cannot be regarded as emblems of the Christian profession. Neither do we meet with any other indication of the adoption of the verities of revelation by the romanized Britons."

Mr. Thomas Wright goes even farther than this and claims that christianity was not known in Britain until a period much later than the Gothic revolts. "The rites of Odin or Wodin were brought by these barbarians from Scandinavia and the Continent; and an eminent antiquarian says that after the conquest of Britain, Saxon paganism was everywhere substituted for Roman, and it was only perhaps in a few cases, chiefly, we may suppose in the towns, that individuals preserved for a while their respect for Roman gods, or their attachment to Roman ceremonies." After mentioning that in one case what at first sight, appeared to be Christian emblems, were found in a "clearly pagan interment" and in others, similar emblems with Byzantine and Frankish coins, cowries from the Orient and other articles imported from foreign countries, he disposes of the subject with the warning that, "approaches to the cross-shape in fibulæ, ornaments, and safety-pins, worn on the person or attached to the clothing, found in Saxon graves, must not be taken to prove any connection with christianity," because the cross is much more ancient than christianity, and because other and more convincing circumstances prove the graves to be those of pagans.

The substance of all the antiquarian evidence and of all the valid literary evidence on the subject is that christianity did not make its appearance in Britain until the period of Pope Gregory's missionaries in the sixth century, and that it did not obtain a general footing in the Island before the æra of Charlemagne. When it did appear, it made its mark upon every institution of society. The distinguishing trait of the Christian religion—one that some doctors of divinity seem to have strangely overlooked—is its capacity of improvement, its adaptability to the ever changing conditions of society, and to the varied wants and aspirations of man. This is the Roman part of it, the legendary part is Buddhic, Gallic and Jewish; the ceremonies are drawn from many sources. All other religions are fixed, christianity alone moves with the times. Brahminism, Brahma-Buddhism, Judaism, Mahometanism, all are fixed. The Brahmin cannot change his caste, nor the Brahmo-Buddhist his "vehicle." The Judean dare not alter the law of Moses, nor the Moslem the Koran. But christianity has changed an hundred times and will change an hundred more, a

characteristic that is alone sufficient to ensure its survival when all codified religions shall be dead and forgotten.¹¹

While it is denied that christianity existed in Britain previous to the pontificate of Gregory, it is not meant that none of the symbols, nor ceremonies, now employed in religious worship existed before that time. On the contrary, many of these exoteric marks of religion were thus employed, but they are of extremely ancient date, they were employed long before the Christian æra and they were continued to be employed afterwards; so that their employment by one sect or another has been continuous for twenty or thirty centuries. Therefore they cannot with propriety be adduced to prove either the introduction or the establishment of christianity.¹²

¹¹ Contrasting the rules for burnt offerings and sacrifices in Leviticus with their rejection in Psalms, LI, 16, Prof. Max Müller says: "There is growth here, as evident as can be, however difficult it may be to some students of religion to reconcile the idea of growth with the character of a revealed religion." *Origin and Growth of Religion*, p. 134. As with language, so "religion also has been shown to exhibit a constant growth and development, its very life consisting in a discarding of decayed elements, which is necessary in order the better to maintain whatever is still sound and vigorous. . . . A religion that cannot change . . . is swept away violently in the end." p. 263. . . . "A religion which is not able to grow and live with us as we grow and live, is dead already." p. 380. It is to be regretted that after opening this great subject, so talented and influential a writer should have trifled with its conclusions, in the manner shown a little further on in the same work.

¹² For crucifixes deposited in the ancient temples of Benares and Mathura and other temples on the Ganges, see Maurice's *Indian Antiquities*, II, 361; for allusion to ancient crosses in the Serapion and other temples on the Nile, see the works of Godfrey Higgins, Rev. R. Taylor, Rev. A. Hislop, Rev. Dr. Reeves, and Sir Wm. Hamilton. Nearly every Egyptian representation of a god (there are hundreds of them in the British Museum) holds a crucifix, or crook, and often both of these sacred symbols, in his hand. These works of art are ascribed to æras many centuries B. C. There are Gallo-Greek coins in the same collection, with large crosses conspicuously displayed upon them, belonging to the fourth and fifth centuries B. C. The Ptolemaic Egyptian coins are also stamped with crosses as sacred symbols. There are Roman coins older than the Christian æra which display the cross surmounting the sacred hat of the pontifex maximus. Indeed, it is well known now that crosses, in common with the various sacred symbols, not only of christianity, but also of other religions, were used very anciently in the same way, and often with the same meanings that they still retain. The sacerdotal punishment of crucifixion is mentioned in Greek and Roman laws enacted long previous to the Christian æra, and it is evident that there could have been no crucifixion without a cross. Astyges crucified the magi. Herodotus, *Clio*, 128. "Inarus, king of the Libyans, was betrayed by treachery and fastened to a cross." Thucydides, (Smith's ed.) p. 85. The use of the cross as a symbol of immortality is as ancient as the belief in the incarnation of Iesnu or Vishnu, that is to say, from twelve to fifteen centuries B. C.

CHAPTER IV

FROM AGRICOLA TO THE SACK OF LONDON.

Three æras of Romano-British progress—Absolute proctorship of the proconsuls—The procurators—Agricola's proconsulship—Construction of the Inner Wall—Circumnavigation of Britain—Conquest of Ireland—Commerce of London—Successors of Agricola—The two races of native Britons—Extinction of the Gælic natives—The Roman conscription—Construction of the Outer Wall—Zenith of provincial prosperity—Frequent revolts of the Norse-Britons against emperor-worship and proconsular exactions—Irregular pay of the legions—Desertions—Rising of the Norse Mæatæ—Removal of Roman merchants to Gaul—Diminished commerce of the province—The emperor Commodus—The Norse-Britons force the Outer Wall—Mutiny of the troops—Perrenius—Pertinax—Albinus—Disorders of the empire—Virus Lupus—Subdivision of Britain—The Norse-Britons again force the Outer Wall—They exact "Dane-geld"—Septimius Severus defeats them—Further disorders of the empire—The Mæatæ again—Roman Britain governed at Treves—Defects of this system—The fleet stationed at Boulogne—Sack of London, circ. 280—The Mæisian and Thracian Goths.

THE archæological remains of Roman Britain roughly indicate three periods or phases of developement through which its civilization passed before the occurrence of the great provincial revolts. From the landing of Aulus Plautius to the government of Agricola, (an interval of less than half a century,) was a period of exploration and settlement. From Agricola to the Mutiny in 187, an interval of about a century, was a period of growth. Between the mutiny of the troops and the provincial risings there elapsed two centuries of relative decay. One-half of this period, brings us down to that Sack of London which is treated in the present chapter: the other half of the period marks the downfall of pagan imperial rule.

The revolt of Boadicea is attributed by Tacitus chiefly to two causes: First, her father, Prasutagus, king of the Iesenimanni, Ieseni, or Icenii, had amassed considerable wealth, which he left "by his will to his two daughters and the emperor, in equal shares"; but, upon his death, the imperial procurator, disregarding the will, seized the estate for the Crown, and let loose a band of soldiers upon the property, who not only pillaged and devastated it, but committed the most cruel and dastardly outrages upon the persons of his wife and daughters. Second, "the temple erected to the deified Claudius, which to the eyes of the Britons seemed the citadel of eternal slavery, and the priests appointed

to officiate at the altars, who, with a pretended zeal for religion, devoured the entire substance of the country.”¹

Assuming that Prasutagus was, like Cogidanus of Britain, Ptolemy of Egypt, Antipater and Herod of Judea, Deiotaurus of Galatia, Tiridates of Parthia, etc., a vassal king, his estate legally reverted, at death, to the emperor of Rome. His people, in refusing to yield it peaceably to the imperial procurator, therefore placed themselves in the wrong. The acts of violence and rapine that followed, were the usual consequences of vassalian resistance. Like Montezuma, fifteen centuries later, Prasutagus probably thought but lightly of the flattering compact which named him the “ally,” whilst it really made him the vassal of Rome; and it was an ill turn of fate that compelled his hapless wife and daughters to expiate so cruelly what was at worst but the blunder of an unlettered and semi-civilized chieftain.

The erection of a temple to the deified Claudius in the principal city of the Ieseni, placed the Romans in the wrong. After making every allowance for that zeal of proselytism, which, whether pagan or Christian, has ever distinguished the imperial church of Rome, this act constituted an unnecessary and gratuitous insult to a conquered and unoffending people. Of course, the temple contained a statue of the god, and the Ieseni were doubtless obliged to revere and adore this detested idol whenever they passed it. More irritating than all, they were obliged to support its shiftless priesthood and their idle retinue of readers, clerks, and sacerdotal virgins. There was no excuse for the erection of this fane, there was no native idolatry (from the Roman point of view) to suppress; for the Romans themselves were divided into two religious sects, the polytheists and Julianists, the former of whom practised a religion which probably resembled that of the Ieseni. But the time was changed, it was the reign of Nero, himself a deity of the Julian cult, and the Romans, who had formerly placated a conquered world in the name of Jove the Thunderer, now aroused it to indignation by demanding the worship of Claudius *curruca*.²

The revolt of the Ieseni has a deeper significance than has hitherto been imagined: it was the first protest of the English race against the hierarchy of Rome, and a slow but inevitable justice will one day raise, far above the statues of all its long line of saints and heroes, the mournful but resolute figure of the martyred Boadicea.³

Until Agricola completed the conquest of the Island, the Roman

¹ Annals, xiv, 31.

² Juvenal, Satire vi, line 275.

³ The revolt of Julius Vindex in Gaul, which occurred a few years after that of Boadicea in Britain, seems to have been due to similar causes and to have ended the same way.

soldiers were continually employed in expeditions against the natives, in the construction of forts, castles, and military roads, and in the establishment of mining works, plantations, and small settlements; and although they were aided by artificers from Gaul and by the rude labour of the enslaved natives, the work of the soldiers was intense and unremitting, and was not at all conducive to an amiable temper towards the conquered, especially those who differed from them in religious belief. There can be little doubt that the attitude of the Romans toward the South Britons was afterwards reflected with the greatest fidelity in the conduct of the Spaniards toward the aboriginal Mexicans and Peruvians.

Beside the soldiers, the artificers, and the women, whom the former had chosen from among the natives,⁴ the Roman settlements at this early period probably embraced only the civil officers of government, the priesthood, a few exiles, and perhaps also some mining and commercial adventurers from Italy. In addition to military works, the betterments of the period were all of a temporary and makeshift character, such as one sees at the present time in Western America: rough roads, staked camps, wooden shanties, "prospecting holes," and a careless, expansive tillage. The principal city of the province was Camulodunum, whose restored temple, after the suppression of Boadicea's revolt, was honoured with a statue of the deified Nero. It also contained a theatre and a public bath. At the same date Verulamium (near the modern St. Albans) was a municipal town with a castle.

The occupation of Bath is assigned to so early a date as the year 53 or 54, and that of Wroxeter to the year 69. The former date is deduced from Tacitus, the latter from the antiquities. Common sense must decide upon their historical significance. The temple, the statue of Nero, and the theatre, at Colchester, as well as the castle at St. Albans, may all have been of wood. Bath and Wroxeter may have been military posts, or mining camps. Twenty years' occupation of a wild country hardly affords time enough for the erection of permanent works or edifices. Boadicea's warriors, though destitute of military appliances of their own, appear to have had but little difficulty in destroying those of the Romans at Colchester. All these evidences indicate temporary works and structures. That the gold, silver, lead, and tin mines were worked during this period is evident from the pigs of lead, and silver-lead with the names of the emperors "Claudius," "Nero," "Vespasianus," and "Domitianus," cast upon them, and from the well-known order in which these metals are sought for; alluvial gold always

⁴ Tacitus, *Agricola*, xxiii.

preceding gold, silver, and lead in veins. But such early working of the mines only confirms the general rule that the period was one of exploration and settlement. We see the same thing to-day in South Africa. Insurances upon ships during the reign of Claudius and some other evidences of an apparently permanent state of affairs, are really invalid; because they belong not to Britain, but to Rome. The close of the exploring period is marked by the completion, in 78, of the great highways which had been commenced during the reign of Claudius. This was also the year in which Agricola, who had already once served in Britain, returned from Rome, this time to assume the proconsulship of the province.

As the present work is designed rather to supplement than supplant the accepted histories, it is not necessary to repeat those evidences of executive ability which Tacitus has connected with the administration of his father-in-law. Other testimony assures us that the account is substantially true, and that Britain at this period, more than at any previous one, enjoyed the benefits of good government. With the retirement of Agricola, the affairs of the province experienced a great change. The proconsuls became in many ways essentially absolute. Like the emperors, their masters, they no longer obeyed the law, but made it. Proconsular law was theoretically subject to revision at Rome; but so long as it did not affect, or threaten to affect, the revenues of the fisc and the Sacred College, such revision was, in point of fact, but rarely made. Under the circumstances, it would be strange if the proconsular office did not succeed in appropriating for itself a share of the revenues subject to its sway. The mines probably sufficed to appease the demands of Church and State, but something more lucrative or productive than the mines was needed to satisfy the greed of a continual succession of necessitous proconsuls. Precisely the same sort of government was established a dozen centuries later in Spanish America, and we can trace, with the greatest assurance, the course of one by that of the other. It cannot be doubted that every sack of wool exported from Britain, every pipe of wine brought into it, every incident of commercial activity, was laden with a tax, imposed not so much to satisfy the demands of the imperial government, as the necessities or requirements of the proconsul. The fact that the office was regarded as a prize, to be contended for by politicians and court favourites, is in itself sufficient evidence of its profitable character.

In 78-80 Agricola constructed his two great lines of fortification, constituting the Great Wall and ditch from the Tyne to the Solway. He also established many new ore-reduction works and mining towns

in Britain. In the following year he attacked and subdued the Norsemen of Caledonia and strengthened that country with fortifications and intrenched camps, many of which afterwards developed into towns. In these operations he appears to have made such liberal use of the Gælic Britons, both in erecting forts and in fighting the Norsemen, that the former, as a distinct race, disappeared from Roman history. "From this time forward, when the Roman writers speak of the Britons who existed in the Island, as a people, they included under that name only the Caledonian tribes of the North."⁵ This is a circumstance which modern historians have passed over far too lightly. The Gælic tribes, the Druids, the worshippers of gods and the followers of rites foreign to the Romans, were put to the roughest work, worn out, destroyed, and their race exterminated. The men of the Norse tribes, not afield, were absorbed into the Roman legions and sent to distant provinces, in exchange for soldiers from other provinces who were stationed in Britain. The Norsewomen within the lines were absorbed into Roman barracks and camps, to become the mothers of a new and mixed race, with Romance names, aptitudes, thoughts, passions, virtues, vices, merits, and defects.

In 84, the last year of Agricola's government, his fleet sailed around the extremities of Scotland, and according to Tacitus, proved Britain to be an island. But in this respect the partiality of the historian has certainly misled him: because more than a century previously it had been described as an island by Cæsar.⁶ Tacitus himself, in another place, makes the natives allude to it as an island. Twenty years before Agricola's exploit the Usipian troops who, previous to Agricola's voyage, had deserted from the Roman legions in Britain, and escaped to the Continent, appear to have sailed around the northern extremity of Scotland, and thus proved Britain to be an island.⁷

Writing about the year 95, Tacitus alludes to London, as "famous for its many merchants and stores of merchandise," from which it may be inferred either that London at this period was an emporium connected with the Baltic trade, or else that the population of Britain had been recently and largely recruited from the other Roman provinces; for the mere demands of the military establishment were hardly sufficient to create or sustain so great a mart. These recruits probably consisted in part of agriculturists from Scandinavia or the Low Countries and artificers from Gaul. Judging from the description which Tacitus gives of the anarchical condition of Rome during the sovereignty of Tiberius, many Italians of eminence and wealth, may have

⁵ Wright, 130.

⁶ *De Bell. Gall.*, v, 12.

⁷ Tacitus, Agricola, xxviii, 32.

also been glad to escape from beneath the jealous and suspicious eyes of the imperial pontiff, and remove to a province distant enough to offer them a peaceful retreat and the security of social oblivion.

The year 96 is assigned to that satire of Juvenal in which he alludes to Ireland and the Orkneys as recent acquisitions of the Roman arms: "*Arma quidem ultra littora Juvernæ promovimus, et modò captas, Orcadas, ac minimâ contentos nocte Britannos.*" "Although our arms advance beyond Juverna's (Hibernia's) shores, though the Orcades (Orkneys) are just subdued."⁸

The proconsular successors of Agricola were nearly all of them of the stamp previously indicated. Sullustius Lucullus, by his exactions and tyranny, provoked a rising of the natives under Arviragus. Neratius Marcellus provoked other risings, until at length the emperor Hadrian was induced to visit the province in person, A. D. 120, partly with a view to reform the abuses which had given rise to such dangerous insurrections. Among the other transactions of this monarch was the issue of a mandate to construct an Inner Wall, namely, that one whose remains are still to be seen stretching from the Solway to the Tyne, or from near Carlisle to Newcastle.

In the same year Ptolemy published his Geography, which contains a list of Roman towns in Britain and a description of the native tribes. Many antiquarians have accepted both these data, as though they necessarily related to the same period, whereas, it is evident that, whilst a list of towns might be made in a few hours and compiled from very recent information, a description of uncivilized tribes was very likely to have been compiled from data several generations old. As a matter of fact, when Ptolemy's work was published there were no longer any Cantii, known as such, in Kent, nor Regni in Surrey, nor Belgæ in Wessex, nor Trinobantes in Essex or Norfolk. All the natives within the Roman lines had become Romano-Britons; their tribal existence was effaced. A considerable proportion of the men had been transported to distant provinces; their language was no longer spoken in Britain; scarcely a trace of it remained. The Welsh of the present time are not the ancient Britons of Britain, nor is their language British.⁹ Such of the natives as were not wearing out a hopeless existence in the mines and quarries of Britain, or in stopping hostile arrows in Caledonia, had been conscripted for the military service of Rome in distant lands. The Notitia mentions detachments of Britons in Egypt, Armenia, Spain, Illyricum, Pannonia, Gaul, Italy, and other countries; and in view of Rome's habitual policy in this respect, it cannot be

⁸ Satire II, 159.

⁹ Wright, 219, 401.

doubted that the deportation of all Britons of the military ages and their replacement by aliens was begun from the moment that Agricola completed the conquest of the province.

At the outset, the Norse-Britons willingly supplied the Romans with new levies; they even paid their tributes with alacrity¹⁰; but when they perceived that these tributes were devoted to the support of a detested idolatry, and when the conscription threatened to withdraw all their youth to distant realms and the tributes were supplemented by proconsular exactions and oppressions, these natives fled from the Romans to the rude but friendly fastnesses of Caledonia, and, summoning to their aid their relatives in the Norse lands, boldly made war upon the oppressors. Over and over again, were the allies defeated by the legions, but, nothing daunted, the Norse British and Caledonians, imbued with a high resolve, and fired with the prospect of plunder, continued to attack, until, as we shall see, they eventually prevailed.¹¹ The medieval monks, not suspecting the true causes of these uprisings, have invented what is called the Anglo-Saxon conquest to supplement the withdrawal of the imperial forces from the Island. When this portion of the history of England comes to be further dealt with, we shall see which account is the more reliable.

In 140 Lollius Urbicus reconstructed the Outer Wall. This work connected together the line of forts previously constructed by Agricola, and stretched from the firth of Forth to that of Clyde. It sufficed to keep in check the fierce tribes who dwelt to the northward, and who, although their land had been over-run and fortified by Agricola, had never wholly lost its possession, and only awaited a suitable opportunity to drive the Romans back and resume its entire dominion. Such an opportunity occurred in 161, upon the accession of the emperor Marcus Aurelius,¹² but the insurgents were checked by the new proconsul, Aufidius Victorinus, and we hear of no further attempts of this kind, until some twenty years later.

¹⁰ Tacitus, Agricola, XIII.

¹¹ A pious invention of modern date has ascribed the first payment of Rome-scat to Ina, king of Wessex, but the term betrays the fiction. Wherever christianity was established, scats ceased to be issued and pence took their place. Rome-scat was the tax paid to the pagan church of Rome. When the christianized church controlled the revenues, that is to say, in Britain after the death of Maurice, there was no more Rome-scat; its new name was Peter's pence, and it was Peter's pence, and not Rome-scat, that Ina paid. The old name might have hung on for a while longer, especially in remote places, but it substantially perished with the issue of the scat itself.

¹² Marcus Aurelius promoted a "revival" of the Julian religion by requiring himself to be worshipped as god. This may have had no little to do with the insurrection of the Goths.

This period has been taken to mark the zenith of Roman imperial power generally throughout the empire. A similar point was probably not reached in Britain by itself until the mutiny of 187. After the death of Marcus Aurelius in 180, the exactions and oppressions of the proconsuls, which his vigorous reign had partly arrested, were renewed, and extended toward the colonists, as well as the natives. In consequence of this policy, the citizens and traders who, within thirty years after London was destroyed by Boadicea, had assisted to make it "famous for its many merchants and stores of merchandise," now began to desert it and remove to Gaul, which being a much more extensive province and not so far removed from imperial supervision, afforded less scope for proconsular avidity and oppression.

This movement was greatly hastened by the Mutiny and the feeling of insecurity which a consideration of its causes evoked. It is well known that the legions were irregularly and insufficiently paid. As they were composed almost entirely of aliens having no especial affection for Rome, many of the soldiers deserted to the enemy, among whom the chance of plundering the Roman settlements seemed more promising than that of receiving their arrears of pay.¹³ These deserters taught their allies how to make and use Roman weapons and the Roman art of fighting in column, and it was probably owing to their disclosures concerning the defences of the Roman settlements, that larger reinforcements of the Goths were attracted from Norway, with the view to make a combined attack upon the province. The newcomers were called by the Latinized name of *Mætætæ*. They seem to have been well accustomed to the water, for Dion Cassius gives them credit for being able to live in the marshes for several days at a time, and with little more than their heads above the surface. Mr. Wright is of opinion that the *Mætætæ* were Norsemen, and this appears to have been that of Bishop Stillingfleet and others, among them, Dr. Russell, who, as before stated, extended it to the Picts.¹⁴ Some of these authorities based their conclusions upon archæological data; the others upon philological and ethnical grounds. Whoever the *Mætætæ* were, they evidently meant mischief: for they had the temerity to assemble under the Outer Wall, where they rattled their ringed spears in the faces of the legionary troops and dared them to leave their ramparts and fight them in the open.

The intelligence that a numerous force of well-armed and deter-

¹³ On the alien and mercenary character of the Roman forces in Britain, see the speech of Gaius to the Caledonians, in Tacitus, *Agricola*, xxxii.

¹⁴ *Hist. Europe*, i, 43.

mined insurgents had encamped close to the Wall gave great alarm to the inhabitants of the Roman towns and hastened that removal to Gaul of the commercial and artisan classes which had already begun. This exodus of industrious people compelled the lords who lived upon country estates to make preparations for their own security, by strengthening, fortifying, and provisioning their habitations, until they came to possess many of those self-contained attributes which distinguished the castles of that later period with which history has rendered us more familiar.

In 183, upon the accession of Commodus to the pontifical and imperial crown, the Norse-Britons scaled the Outer Wall, cut the frontier guards to pieces, and ravaged the entire country between that and the Inner Wall. Northumbria was lost to the empire in a single night. This was the heaviest blow which the Roman power had ever received in Britain, and it led to other catastrophies. It showed the northern tribes that the empire was not invulnerable, and that its mercenary troops, though Romanized, were still aliens, with no greater love for their employment than what was excited by the hopes of pay. On the other hand, the plunder carried off by the Norsemen taught the troops that treason and desertion were much more profitable than fidelity to Rome.

After the reverse at the Outer Wall, a new viceroy, Ulpius, was appointed, the Roman forces were shifted, veterans were sent to the front and the Norsemen were driven back beyond the Wall. But no sooner was this object accomplished than Ulpius was displaced by a new imperial favorite, named Perennius, who, upon his arrival in Britain, changed many of the commanders and attempted to enforce measures so distasteful to the troops as to occasion a Mutiny. Among these measures none was more likely to drive the legions to such an extremity than their payment in silver-plated iron coins. A large number of such coins, stamped with effigies of Claudius and other previous emperors, and packed in tiers, as though they had been imported into Britain from abroad, were found in London during the early part of the present century, when King William Street was being laid out. Mr. Wright is of the opinion that they were employed for the payment of the troops, and no period seems more appropriate to assign to this use, than the period previous to the Mutiny of the year 187.

Although the emperor hastened to repair the error he had made in appointing Perennius to the proconsulship, by sacrificing that unfortunate officer to the fury of his accusers, and by appointing Pertinax in his place, the dissatisfaction of the troops continued; a proof that

the cause lay deeper than a change of commanders. Upon the arrival of Pertinax in Britain the mutinous troops proposed to throw off the authority of Rome altogether and raise the proconsul to an independent throne; and when he prudently refused this dangerous pre-eminence, they struck him down and left him for dead. Pertinax, however, succeeded in restoring order, and soon afterwards returned to Rome, leaving Albinus in command of the province.

The murder of the emperor Commodus, the elevation of the same Pertinax to the imperial throne by the prætorian guards, the assassination of Pertinax three months later, the virtual sale of the imperial throne to the usurer Didius Julianus, the rise of Septimius Severus in Pannonia, of Pescennius Niger in Syria, and of Albinus in Britain, all of whom claimed and assumed the blood-stained purple, the murder of Didius Julianus, the placation of Albinus, the defeat of Pescennius, the devastation of Byzantium, because it had sheltered and championed him, the seizure of the imperial throne by Septimius, and the defeat and death of Albinus, all occurred within the five years, 193-7.

After having secured himself in his perilous position, Septimius, in 196, appointed one of his most faithful adherents, Virius Lupus, to the government of Britain, and this officer at once hastened to the scene of his new command and set about making such reforms in the administration as the state of affairs appeared to require. Among these was the division of the country into seven provinces, which, at a later period, and with some modification of boundaries, became the seven so-called Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, or Heptarchy.¹⁵ There could hardly have been any other reason for such subdivision than that proctorship of authority which was to be observed going on in all parts of the empire, and which was the necessary consequence of its hierarchical form of government. The emperor, who was also the chief-pontiff of Rome, and commonly worshipped as a god, was too sacred a personage to directly transact the affairs of state, and he had to be represented by a vicar, legate, or proconsul. The proconsul being placed in authority over native kings and princes, soon became too important an officer to be directly approached, and he too exercised his office by proxy; and so it continued down to the lowest stratum of official rank. Everything was done by somebody else, and consequently was

¹⁵ From a comparison of certain Anglo-Saxon coins of very rude design, Mr. Evans was induced to assign them to six districts, or petty kingdoms, whose geographical position corresponded more or less with the subsequent heptarchical kingdoms. Hawkins, "English Silver Coins," p. 10. They are more likely to correspond with six of the seven provincial districts into which Britain was divided by the Romans, and which formed the basis of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

done badly. Tacitus expressly states that the most essential matters were commonly neglected. The division of the Island into seven sub-provinces had some apparent advantages, it provided for seven new officers, each of whom was required to take care of his own government, and it probably led to the organization of those local means of defence, including a body of yeomanry, which the frequent and rapid attacks of the barbarians had rendered necessary for the security of the province. Notwithstanding these preparations, or perhaps because of his having made them, the proconsul fancied that he might prudently spare some of the imperial troops for service on the Continent; whereupon the Norsemen, in 205, again forced the Outer Wall, overran the district between the walls, put its defenders and inhabitants either to flight or the sword, and intrenched themselves in Roman strongholds, from which, during the two years following, they sallied at intervals to extend their conquests and augment their plunder.

Under these circumstances Virius determined upon a line of policy, which, while it temporarily averted further aggressions, was eventually followed by the most pernicious consequences: he bought off the enemy with gold. Assuming the Mæatae to have been Norsemen, this was the first "Danegeld" or "Gotgeld" paid in Britain. The payment of such a tribute naturally inflamed the appetites of the enemy for further riches. It also increased their strength and military resources, by tempting their kinsmen to come over in increasing numbers from Scandinavia, Saxland and Frisia. The truce was again and again broken and renewed, until at length Virius, despairing of dealing successfully with the enemy, sent a message to the emperor, asking for strong reinforcements of troops, and representing the advantages which might result from the attendance of the imperial presence itself in Britain.

Septimius Severus acceded to this suggestion by rapidly assembling an army and making a forced march through Gaul. He arrived at York, then the principal city of Britain, in the winter of the year 208. After concluding preparations for a crushing and decisive campaign, he was enabled in the spring of 209 to take the field with a well disciplined force. The result of this campaign was a complete triumph for the Roman legions, who penetrated to the northernmost extremity of the Island, dispersing the enemy as they advanced, and forcing them either into the mountainous wilds, or into their boats and away altogether. But it was a triumph that, although it is said to have cost the aged emperor the almost incredible number of 50,000 troops, only lasted for a short time. Pending the renewal of further hostilities,

Septimius employed his forces in strengthening the Inner Wall, to which was now added a stone rampart from end to end; and it may have been in the arduous labour of this stupendous undertaking that many of the troops succumbed, whose loss the Latin historians attribute to the Caledonian campaign.

In the summer of 210 the mysterious Mæataë again united with the Caledonians to harass the Roman frontiers. This time the emperor was unable to punish them. He died at York in February 211, leaving the empire to his two worthless and profligate sons, Caracalla and Geta. After cremating their father's body, these sons carried its ashes to Rome, where, shortly afterwards, the assassination of one son by the other, restored the apparent unity, yet only served to hasten the downfall, of the empire. The disorders of this period were the symptoms, not the causes, of imperial decay, and need but the briefest mention in this place. They were of similar character in all parts of the empire. Vicarious authority, the usurpation of the imperial purple by ambitious proconsuls, the desertion of the soldiers, their alliance with the barbarians, and the appearance of these allies wherever plunder or ransom was to be gained. A Syrian (Elagabalus) a Norseman (Maximin) and an Arabian (Philip) successively wore a crown which had now become but too often the plaything of an insolent soldiery and the reward of treachery and assassination. The eastern Goths, largely enforced by deserters from the Roman army, had devastated Dacia and Mœsia, defeated the hitherto invincible legions and extorted from the emperor of Rome the price of future forbearance.¹⁶ The simultaneous assertion of thirty proconsular claims to a tottering and ensanguined throne, only served to mark the splendour of the prize and the dissolution of the social forces by which it had previously been upheld.

Emboldened by the disorders at Rome, the tribes of Norse-Britons and their allies made unusual preparations to regain possession of their native Island. A band of hardy Scots crossed the Irish channel and joined the Caledonians. Other bands under Norse vikings made predatory descents upon the south and south-east coasts. The roving tribes who surrounded the half deserted province all hastened to enjoy their share of the revenge and spoil, which its reoccupation promised. Only the Romans and those natives who had become domesticated as Roman servants, trembled at its impending fall.

¹⁶ In the reign of the emperor Philip, the city of Marcianopolis the capital of Mœsia, paid ransom to a mixed army of Roman deserters, Goths, and Slavs. Two years later the Goths defeated the emperor Decius and sacked Philipopolis.

A pardonable but misleading pride has too commonly concealed the fact that at this period the provincial government of Britain had ceased to derive its authority directly from Rome. Its proconsul was subject to the *præfectus prætorio Galliarum* who during the reign of Diocletian resided at Treves and at a later period, at Arles.¹⁷ The government being in Gaul, the head-quarters of the fleet were fixed at Boulogne, a circumstance that afforded no little encouragement to the designs of the Norse vikings. On the north-eastern coasts these adventurers received aid from their kinsmen and allies without the Walls; on the southern coasts their depredations were encouraged by many of those who dwelt within them. Between the years 276 and 283 they appear to have captured and sacked the city of London, and in this enterprize they were probably aided by that reckless band of Norsemen, who, having escaped from Roman vassalage in Mœsia and Thrace, sailed through the Bosphorus and the Straits of Hercules, (Gibraltar,) and returned to their homes in Scandinavia by way of the British channel.

¹⁷ Gibbon; Wright; and Palgrave, 324, 359. It was Diocletian, a pagan emperor, who divided the empire into vicarages.

CHAPTER V.

THE LAST CENTURY OF PAGAN IMPERIAL RULE.

The Sack of London by the Goths, circ. 280, was probably shared by the Thracian Franks—Their daring cruise from the Black Sea to the Thames—Usurpation of Carausius, the Goth—Distraction of the Empire—Simultaneous rebellions in various provinces—Britain again reduced to imperial rule—Constantine becomes sole emperor—The imperial capital removed to Byzantium—Constantine insults the god Thor—Indignation of the Goths—They rebel in Mœsia, Saxony, and Britain—London again sacked—Theodosius defeats the rebels, reëstablishes the imperial rule, and earns the surname of Saxonicus—The Angles of North Britain—The Welsh—The conflict of the idolatrous religions of these races eventually paved the way for christianity in Britain.

OVID, perhaps because unlike the pliant Virgil, he disdained to worship Julius as the Father, or refused to proclaim with Manilius the gospel of Augustus, the Son, was banished by the latter to Lower Mœsia, there to repent in vain and to die among the half savage Getæ. After Ovid's death, this tribe, whom both historians and archæologists have recognized as Goths, were frequently reduced in numbers by the Roman military conscription, but appear to have been reinforced by accessions from the North. Among other emperors who promoted or permitted such reinforcement, was Probus. The recruits who were introduced into Mœsia and Thrace during his reign, were known as Frakki.¹ There are reasons for believing these people to be identical with the northern sea-coast, or Salian Franks.² Their removal to Thrace was intended, in the words of Eumenius, "to promote the peace of the Roman empire by their planting and the strength of its armies by their recruits."³

These sea-wolves had no sooner taken the bearings of the country and learnt where the principal treasures of the imperialists were deposited, than they conceived the daring design to plunder them, escape entirely from the Roman dominions and return to their homes,

¹ Frakki is the Gothic word for a spear.

² In discussing the genuineness and antiquity of the Codex Argenteus, Michaelis fetches the Goths of Mœsia from the Crimea. But this theory, although perhaps well founded, does not explain why some of these Goths found it necessary to circumnavigate the whole of Europe in order to reach their homes. Marsh's Michaelis, II, I, 45.

³ Eumenius, Const., Aug., c. 6, written circ. 311.

by way of the Bosphorus, the Pillars of Hercules, and the Atlantic Ocean. This was an enterprise which none but practical sea-men would have been likely to entertain, and none but bold and skilled ones, would have attempted. The plot having duly ripened, the band broke loose and made their way to a port of Thrace, on the Black Sea—probably Apollonia—and there, seizing upon a number of sea-galleys, they made sail for the Bosphorus. This dangerous strait having been successfully passed, they steered for the coast of Greece, where they landed for provisions and water. After raiding the neighbouring villages, whose poor defences almost invited their rapine, they resolved to attempt the Romano-Greek city of Syracuse, in Sicily—Eumenius says they captured the place and Zosimus adds, with great slaughter.⁴ From Syracuse they sailed away and raided the Carthaginian coasts, taking care to avoid the larger towns and garrisons. While thus occupied they were interrupted by the approach of the Roman coast-guard ships, and the adventurers once more took wing and vanished, this time through the strait of Hercules, whither it is probable that no one ventured to follow them. Of what further enterprises they afterwards achieved, we are not apprised, except that according to Zosimus, “they managed to get back to their own country unharmed.”

It is not too much to assume that the men who had the temerity to attempt Syracuse and the coasts of Carthage were quite prepared to attack London. It was a Roman town, that is to say, it belonged to their enemy, it was rich and not impregnable. More than all, in place of the Trinobantes, who had been extirpated in the defeat of Boadicea, the adjacent country was now filled with colonies of Vandals, which was only one of the several Roman names for Goths. These people could be depended upon for information and assistance. The Frakki were desperate men who possessed a number of efficient galleys. They were going home almost empty-handed, and after their exploits in Thrace, Greece, and Carthage, were probably ready to dare anything. Why not London? Some of the old Norse sagas contain an account of how London was attacked, without giving any date to the enterprise; so, whether it was in A. D. 280, or a later attack, cannot be determined. The sagas relate that the Norse-ships sailed up the Thames until they got near London Bridge, then consisting of stone foundations and a wooden superstructure lined with Roman dwelling-houses and shops. The Norsemen thereupon fastened some of their vessels to the bridge, set it on fire, and destroyed it, thus cutting off succour and supplies from the citadel and rendering the latter an easy

⁴ Eumenius, *Const.*, Aug., c. 18; Zosimus, *Probus*, I, 71.

prey. After the capture and sack of the city, the Norsemen appear to have abandoned it, probably to return to the Scandinavian and Saxon coasts, there to enjoy in security the fruits of their daring adventures. It is quite possible that other cities of Britain were sacked as well as London and that these raids were protracted throughout several following years, until they were brought to an end by the operations of Carausius in 286. "England is richest in moveable property of all the northern lands," significantly remarks the *Knytlinga Saga*; and that the vikings made good use of this observation is abundantly testified by the amplitude and variety of the Romano-British plunder which has been found in their graves and tumuli.

The news of the audacious raid upon London, having in due time reached the imperial court, the Roman proconsul in Gaul, one Carausius, who, being a Menapian, was therefore supposed to know something about the sort of people he had to fight against and the sort of ships best fitted to cope with them, was ordered to immediately fit out the imperial fleet and prepare to punish the enemy. This armament set sail in 287 and succeeded in intercepting the Norse fleet;⁶ but Carausius, instead of attacking, came to an amicable understanding with the enemy, the result of which was that the spoil which had been taken by the latter was divided between the commanders of the two fleets and the Norsemen entered the service of Carausius. Landing soon after in Britain, the Menapian proclaimed himself emperor of that province and sending an embassy to Rome he boldly demanded an official recognition of his usurped title and pretensions.

The ease and rapidity which attended this singular revolution in the government of Britain are readily explained when the circumstances of the times are recalled to mind. Not only was the empire divided between two Augusti, a division of authority far more ruinous and embarrassing than though it had been shared by an hundred emperors, it was divided between five Cæsars, all of whom were obliged to keep the field. Egypt having revolted under Saturninus and again under Achilleus, Diocletian was called to the sieges of Alexandria and Coptos. Julian had assumed the purple at Carthage and the Five Nations of Mauritania provoked the fierce vengeance of Maximian Hercules. Persia had made war upon the vassal king of Armenia, whom every consideration of honour and policy commended to the hospitality of Rome and the protecting arm of Galerius. The ever restless tribes of Arabia had closed the portals of the Indian trade and alarmed the southeastern provinces of the empire with apprehensions of invasion.

⁶ Eutropius, ix, 21, describing this incident, calls the enemy "Franci et Saxones."

The Gauls, under the name of Bagaudæ, or insurgents, rose upon their Roman masters, and two of their chieftains, Ælianus and Aman-dus, asserted their sovereignty by assuming the purple and striking native coins. In the bloody repression which followed this rising, Carausius had taken part, and he had probably remarked the extreme difficulty with which Maximian recruited his forces. The empire was tumbling in upon itself. The Roman race had become Gaulicised and Gothicised, many of the Roman commanders were Goths, the religion of emperor-worship had fallen into contempt, the exactions of the Church, of the proconsuls, of the procurators, of the military commanders, were maddening; Probus had compelled the peasants to construct a double Wall and a line of forts in Alsatia two hundred miles in length; an ever grinding conscription drove the provinces to despair; and what little hope of the future had been left untouched by the hand of exaction, was crushed by the iron tyranny of restraint.

Carausius himself was of Gothic or semi-Gothic blood,⁶ he doubtless spoke the Gothic tongue. He was thus more readily enabled to influence the soldiers who had been entrusted with the defence of Britain and to animate the Gothic or semi-Gothic peasants, who at this period must have formed the main portion of its inhabitants. Such were the elements that lay within grasp of the usurper and which afforded that promise of success to his perilous undertaking which it never could have derived from a mere treasonable coalition with the Norse fleet. In other words, Britain was already filled with a semi-Gothic population quite ready to accept a Gothic ruler and to throw off its allegiance to the hierarchy of Rome and its detested worship of emperors.

In 293 Carausius was slain at York by his prime minister, Allectus, who thereupon usurped and ascended the vacant throne of Britain. When the freedom-loving character of the Norsemen is called to mind, it can hardly be supposed that this revolution could have been accomplished without a large following; and we are warranted in conjecturing that there was something more than a mere personal choice between Carausius and Allectus which induced the islanders to renounce one chieftain and adopt the other. Might this reason also have been the same one that, contrariwise, reconciled the Roman government to Carausius, whilst it declared war upon Allectus; and was this the

⁶ On the river Mosel the Romans had erected a fortress called *Castellum Menapiorum*, around which grew up a town. In this town and also between the town and the river Scheldt, there dwelt a tribe of Salian Franks called Menapians, among whom, according to Eutropius, was born Carausius.

acceptance by the former and rejection by the latter of the Roman hierarchical government, and with it the Roman religion? The mutilated literature of this period only informs us that Æsclepiodotus was ordered by the emperor to invade Britain and destroy Allectus and his government; a task which he successfully accomplished in the fourth year of the latter's reign. On this occasion London was again sacked. When Æsclepiodotus had routed the army of Allectus, the fugitives, consisting mainly of the Frankish and Saxon Goths, with whom both Carausius and Allectus had recruited their legions, retreated to London and began to plunder it. The imperial forces, however, surprised them at their work, and put them to flight.

In 306 the Cæsar, Constantius Chlorus, died at York, and his son, Constantine, who was about thirty years of age, was proclaimed Cæsar by the imperial troops then quartered in Britain. He was politic enough to communicate his elevation to Galerius; to soften his own treasonable part in it, by alleging, like Saturninus before him, that he was unable to prevent or undo it; and to entreat the forgiveness and condonation of the emperor. Pending the arrival of a reply, he prudently rebuilt the citadel of London and surrounded it with a strong wall of stone, within which, at a place now occupied by St. Swithin's church, Cannon Street, began the great Roman roads which the Goths afterwards called Watling and Irmin streets. This spot is still marked by "London Stone," probably the remains of a Roman milliarium. Galerius having reluctantly confirmed the elevation of Constantine and assigned to him the dominion of Gaul and Britain, the latter removed his court to Treves, where he fitted out several expeditions against the Frankish Goths, whose resistance to imperial rule had made the valley of the lower Rhine a theatre of constant warfare. After many acts of turpitude, all committed from motives of ambition, Constantine, in 312, entered Rome as a conqueror, and a trembling senate hastened to confirm him as one of the three Augusti, between whom the disjointed empire was now divided. In the course of a few years he succeeded in destroying every obstacle to his ambition, including Maximin, his benefactor, Licinius, his brother-in-law, Fausta, his wife, and Crispus, his son. In 324 he became sole master.

But of what? Of an empire distracted by hierarchical government and three irreconcilable religions, the polytheistic, the Julian or Augustan, and the "Christian"; of a people more barbarian than civilized, and more Gothic and Roman; of an army of mercenaries; and of one hundred and twenty provinces drenched in blood and ruined by vicarious government. It was evidently in the belief that all this

wrong could be righted, and all this history undone by his own hand, that Constantine promptly took sides with a religious party, of whose tenets he was unmistakably ignorant, but which, nevertheless, comprised some of the most wealthy and influential families of Rome and Alexandria. Following out the same idea, he resolved to be rid of the Julianists by removing the court to Byzantium, whither he also caused to be conveyed the most precious treasures and works of art that remained in the empire.⁷ The dedication of this ancient city by the new name of Constantinople took place in 330, and among the earliest decrees that bore its stamp was that new political charter by which the conqueror hoped to save the falling state.

But no charter could save it now. The Goths, who surrounded, who invaded, who filled, the empire, were not in a mood to listen either to the gospel of peace or the provisions for local feudal government which were contained in the New Constitution. Their blood was up. They had endured all that a race of men can endure in peace. Constantine at Treves had thrown their captured leaders into the arena, there to be devoured by wild beasts. He had impressed all their youth into his legions, and marched them off to distant parts of the world, never to return. The emperor was no longer a god, for, if the monkish account be true, he had embraced a religion which acknowledged a god superior to all earthly dieties. Rome was no longer the seat of empire, and the allegiance due to the empire on account of the sacred Quirinus was dissolved. The impious emperor, for such they deemed him, had refused to sacrifice even to Thor; and the temples of Byzantium, sacred to that deity of deities, had been converted into churches dedicated to a new and unfamiliar worship.

From Upsala to Cologne and from York to Mœsia the Gothic men arose. While the emperor was called to the defence of the Danube, his eldest son, afterwards Constantine II., fortified the Rhine. But there were other dangers as well as exposed frontiers. Bands of Gothic soldiers who had deserted from the legions were to be seen in all the provinces of the empire preparing to join their kinsmen. Even the troops who surrounded the emperor, failed him, and compelled him to retreat before the champions of Thor and Woden. In Britain the tribes of the north continually gained ground. When Constantine was crowned at York, the frontier was at Edinburgh. Sixty years later it was at London, which the sons of Woden again captured and again sacked. It was at this juncture that Theodosius, the imperial pro-

⁷ Some Egyptologists would have us believe that, ages before, Thotmes III. had for a like reason removed his court to Tel-el-Amarna.

consul, massing his forces at Richborough, marched upon London, put the victors to flight, recaptured the spoil, and took many prisoners, an exploit for which he earned an ovation and the surname of Saxonicus. This surname alone sufficiently indicates the race to which the routed enemy belonged, and makes it impossible to believe the story of a subsequent Anglo-Saxon invasion. Saxonicus could only have been the name of one who had conquered the Saxons.

Ever since the death of Antoninus Pius, and more especially since the subdivision of the empire, desertions from the imperial army had continued. Although the ranks were successively filled by new conscriptions, yet the morale of the troops was deeply affected and the integrity of the empire repeatedly exposed to danger. The deserters either adopted a marauding life, or else joined the enemy, taught them how to make and use Roman arms, inured them to discipline, and pointed out the rich places to despoil, or the weak ones to assault. During the brief reign of Constantine in Britain, the defections of troops were numerous enough to receive notice even in the meagre chronicles of those times. The deserters joined the barbarians in Caledonia, or Gaul, or upon the sea, and shared in their forays upon the Roman frontiers and settlements, which, little by little, were thus driven towards the south-eastern and the interior portions of the island. During the interval between the accession of Constantine and the withdrawal of the Roman legions from Britain—the obscurest period in British history—a tribe of Goths, known as Angles, obtained a footing in the North, while a tribe of Bretons, or Armorican Gauls, from the valleys of the Seine and Loire, whom the Saxons called “Welshe,” or strangers, occupied the western and northwestern parts of Britain. These races, and their kinsmen, who were yet to come, brought with them distinct religions; the Goths, the polytheism of the Mongolian steppes, and the Welshmen, the druid rites of Gaul. The conflict of these discordant religions, combined with the increasing disgust of the provincials for emperor-worship, may have had no little influence in facilitating the subsequent establishment of that higher and purer religion, which is said to have been taught to our forefathers by St. Augustine.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REVOLT UNDER MAXIMUS, 383-9.

Religions of Rome and Britain—Amity of the polytheistic Romans and Goths—Theodosius the Elder—His government of Britain—Valentinian destroys a Julian altar at Paris and consecrates the temple to "St. Stephen," now Notre Dame—Theodosius indignant, but silent—He is removed to the Rhine frontier—Afterwards to Africa, where he chastises the Moors—He is unjustly executed by Gratian—His son, Theodosius, duke of Mœsia, flies to Spain—The place of Theodosius the Elder in Britain is filled by Maximus—The Goths rise in Mœsia and defeat and kill Valens—Gratian comes to the rescue—He calls Theodosius the Younger from his retirement and promises him the Eastern empire—Military successes of the latter—Peace restored—Gratian renews his religious reforms—Demolishes the altar of Victory—Confiscates all the property of the Church of Rome—Bestows its livings upon Christians—Ambrose—Augustine—Priscillian—Revolt of Maximus prompted by the pagan priests—Numbers of the insurgents—They land in Gaul—Gratian flies from Paris—His betrayal and assassination—Maximus, who is recognized by Theodosius, reigns at Paris—He attacks Valentinian II., at Milan—Flight of the latter to Theodosius—These princes combine and defeat Maximus—His death—Theodosius assigns a nominal kingdom to his youthful colleague and enters Rome in triumph—The senate alters the official religion of the empire—End of the revolt under Maximus—Its origin and results.

PROF. MAX MULLER has somewhere said that the most profound and profitable of all studies is the contemplation of those steps by which man has sought to approach his Maker—in other words—religion. In seeking for the causes of the decline of imperial power in Britain, this remark receives corroboration. The Romans in Britain, themselves split into two sects, had to deal with two other religions besides their own, the druidical religion of the Gaels and the Buddhic polytheism of the Goths. The former was subject to an ancient hierarchy; the latter was strengthened by no such bond. The former possessed an organized body of priests and a national church; the latter was destitute of either, for the *hirsars* were warriors, priests, and magistrates combined. In this combination their sacerdotal and civil functions were relatively unimportant. The druidical religion had nothing in common with one of the two great sects of the Romans. The Gothic religion resembled the polytheism of the ancient Roman Commonwealth. Besides substituting Thor for Jupiter Ton-

ans, Woden for Bacchus ¹ and Frica for Venus, it only differed from the creed of Cicero, Pliny, Tacitus, Suetonius, or any of the classical writers whose works have been permitted to reach the modern world, as all coarse conceptions differ from refined ones. Hence the policy of the early Roman conquerors of Britain was to encourage and make allies of the Goths, whose religious faith harmonized with their own most ancient one, and to drive out or extirpate the Gaels, who would probably forever remain irreconcilable enemies. The kingdoms granted to Prasutagus and Cogidanus were granted not to Gaels but to Goths. The campaign against Mona² was directed against the druidical hierarchy, and whilst it affected the Gaelic, did not at all concern the Gothic chiefs, who shared between them the petty kingdoms of Britain.

So long as the Romans held fast to their own ancient religion they need not have had any trouble with the Goths. The latter made good citizens, they recruited the armies and fleets, they filled the offices of state, and some of them even reached the imperial throne. But when the worship of the emperor was added to the polytheistic religion, when the powers of the imperial government were lent to the support of the former, by grants of lands, slaves and benefices, by the erection of temples, and by the employment of priests, all of which support had to be eventually borne by the people, then there was friction between the government and the influential classes of Rome; and resistance on the part of the Gothic and semi-Gothic inhabitants of the provinces. In the course of two or three centuries this resistance burst into organized rebellion, and this rebellion is what has been erroneously styled the Barbarian Invasions. The reader will have already observed some evidences of Gothic disaffection in the desertions of Gothic troops from the legions, in the Caledonian attacks upon the Roman frontiers of Britain, and in the rebellion under Carausius. He will now see what form it assumed previous to that last and successful effort which we have been perversely taught to regard as the first Anglo-Saxon invasion of Britain.

¹ "Modern painters and artists have thought proper to represent Bacchus as a gross, vulgar, and bloated personage; on the contrary, all the ancient poets and artists represent him as a youth of most exquisite beauty." Note to Rev. Wm. Beloe's *Herodotus*, p. 16. The bronze Bacchus taken from the bed of the Tiber at Rome in 1885 has the form of a beautiful youth with feminine features and long curling hair, parted in the middle. As represented in Lanciani's heliotype, he holds in one hand a staff, surmounted by some conical object. If this belonged to the figure, when found, it may be a staff of augury. The other hand, with its raised forefinger, imposes silence, a familiar attitude of the radiated figures of the same god which Mr. Barker excavated at Tarsus in 1845 and attributed to Harpocrates, Horus, etc. Lanciani's "*Ancient Rome*," 308; Barker's "*Lares and Penates*," 181. "The Greeks assure us that Bona Dea is the Mother of Bacchus, whose holy name is not to be uttered." Plutarch, in *Julius Cæsar*. Bacchus was known to the Gauls as Hesus. ² Mona was the Celtic name; Anglesey, the Saxon and later one.

Owing to the mutilation of Roman literature relative to the fourth century and the modern habit of relying too exclusively upon the altered fragments and spurious substitutions which have been permitted to survive, no satisfactory account exists of the rebellion of Maximus.³ The history of this occurrence is connected with the life of Theodosius Saxonicus. In 357, Julian, at that time a Cæsar and general under the Emperor Constantius, sent 800 vessels to Britain for corn. In 360 his head-quarters were at Paris, where he was declared emperor by his troops. The rising of the North Britons, which began in 360, may have derived its immediate stimulus from the scarcity occasioned by Julian's demands for breadstuffs. However this may be, the insurrections of the northern tribes were seconded in 364 by a numerous fleet from the coasts of Saxony. The operations of these combined forces threatening the loss of the province, Valentinian I., then emperor of the West, sent Theodosius in 367 with a strong legionary force to chastise the insurgents and restore the imperial or proconsular authority. The result of these operations was related in the last chapter.

Valentinian had spent the previous year, 365-6, at Paris, whence he directed the operations of Jovinus against the Germans (Alemanni) who at that period threatened the Upper Rhine. Here the emperor filled up the intervals of war with the labours of peace. On the site now occupied by Notre Dame stood a pagan temple once dedicated to Hesus and afterwards to Bacchus. Valentinian destroyed the Bacchic altar, consecrated the church to St. Stephen,⁴ and in like manner proceeded to efface, right and left, every public monument

³ The main object of the fraudulent history of Martin (of Tours) and other monks was to suppress the acts and very existence of Maximus, says Herbert in his "Britannia after the Romans," I, 16.

⁴ In 1711 were exhumed from beneath Notre Dame nine large stones, forming a portion of the wall and altar of an ancient religious edifice. Two of them constituted an altar which had on its four sides, 1st, The effigy and name of IOVIS; 2nd, The name and figure of VOLCANVS; 3rd, The name and figure of HESVS, who is portrayed in the act of cutting a branch of mistletoe with a hatchet; 4th, A bull, with the inscription, TAVROS TRIGARANVS. Another stone, of a later period, contained a dedication by the Nautæ Parisiaci, as follows: TIB CÆSARE AVG IOVI OPTVM MAXIMO NAVTÆ PARISIACI PVBLICE POSIERVNT. Another altar, of still later date, was subsequently discovered beneath the Rue Mathurin, with the following inscription: HOC QVOD EREXIT ATRIVM VIRTVS CONSTANTII D SOLIS ORNAV ALT R VIRTVS JVLIANI CÆSARIS. All these monuments are now in the Hotel de Cluny. The god Hesus is thus referred to in the Pharsalia of Lucan, lib. I, verse 445, written during the reign of Nero:

Et quibus immitis placatur sanguine diro

Teutates horrensque feris altaribus Hesus.

Teu-Tatt, or Deu-Tatt, the god Tat, is one of the many names of the Indian Buddha, or Bacchus. Teutates was a common Roman name for Scythians.

of this worship which defiled the Gaulic metropolis. The details of these pious labours, if they ever reached the ears of Theodosius Saxonicus, could scarcely have imparted to that general any additional encouragement in his campaigns against the Caledonians and Saxons of Britain, for Theodosius himself, so far as he professed any religion at all, sacrificed at the very same altars which his zealous sovereign Valentinian was now employed in suppressing. However, Theodosius, above all things, was a soldier and a Roman. Heedless of the disquieting rumours which reached him from Paris, he repaired Britannia's military Walls once more and drove the barbarians beyond them; concluding his campaigns in 370 and leaving Britain at peace and restored to Roman proconsular rule. During the following year he was removed to the Upper Danube and employed with success against the Alemanni. In 372 he was ordered to Africa. Here there was more trouble. The Moors had resisted the Roman conscription and refused to pay the tribute; Romanus, the governor of Africa, dissatisfied with the sectarian proceedings of the emperor Valentinian, had made common cause with the rebels; and the entire province was in a ferment. Theodosius appeared on the scene in time to prevent any systematic combination of the hostile forces, pursued Firmus, the Moorish commander, to his death, completely broke up and dispersed the enemy, and recovered Africa in the course of two or three campaigns. In 376, upon the conclusion of these brilliant services to the empire, and for no other imaginable reason than that, as a Roman of the old school, he refused or neglected to carry out the iconoclastic commands of Gratian, Theodosius Saxonicus was coldly beheaded at Carthage.

Gratian, the eldest son of Valentinian I., was born in 358, received the title of Augustus during his childhood and succeeded his father to the western division of the empire in 375. To conciliate the party (Arians) which had proclaimed his infant half-brother, Valentinian II., at Rome, he resigned Italy, Illyricum, and Africa to the supremacy of the latter, reserving for himself Spain, Gaul and Britain. In respect of Italy and Illyricum the partisans of Valentinian, who was then but four or five years of age, maintained over these countries a jealous control; in respect of Africa, the military operations, still in progress there, demanded the supervision of an older head, and the government of that province was virtually resigned to Gratian. This prince, with his father's example to guide, and a court filled with zealous priests, to urge him, continued those attempts to mould the religion of the western empire which Valentinian I. had begun; and

it was during the course of these reforms and probably through some miscarriage of justice that the faithful Theodosius suffered an untimely and undeserved death. At that period the victim's son, whose name was also Theodosius, held a command in Mœsia, with the title of duke, under Valens, emperor of the East, and uncle to Gratian and Valentinian II. Alarmed at the sudden and tragical fate which had befallen his father, and fearing for his own safety, Theodosius fled to Spain, his native province, where he had friends and could count upon a safe refuge. We shall hear of him again.

Meanwhile Gratian, probably not sorry to escape the importunities of the sectarians who filled his court of Paris, led an army to the Rhine, where in 378, assisted by his generals, Nanienus and Mellobaudes,⁵ he won the victory of Colmar over the barbarians. In Britain, Theodosius Saxonicus had been succeeded by Maximus Magnus, who also repaired the Walls, drove the Goths into Caledonia and erected the territory between the Walls into a sub-province, which, after the place of his nativity in Spain, or else in deference to the emperor of Rome, was called Valentia. Some war-clouds were gathering over the burning sands of Numidia, but apart from these distant omens, the Western empire was apparently at peace and its frontiers secure from barbarian interruption. Never were signs more deceptive. In 379 the irrepressible Goths again rose and captured the Roman forts of Lower Mœsia. In the absence of the duke Theodosius, who alone had fully succeeded in repressing this turbulent population, the emperor Valens was obliged to take the field in person, not, however, without calling upon his nephew Gratian for all the assistance he could afford. Gratian complied with this request by dispatching Count Richomar and strong reinforcements to the frontiers of Mœsia; but Valens, before a junction could be effected of all his forces and relying too much upon the alliance of Fritigern,⁶ risked a battle with the insurgents, was defeated, and lost his life. His army fled to Constantinople and the victorious leader of the Goths indulged his followers in the sack of the Roman camps.

There was but one man whom the distracted Gratian could depend upon to repair this misfortune and rescue the empire from the greater danger that impended, and to that man he had been guilty, probably more from neglect and the vicarious nature of his government, than from intention, of the gravest injustice. The man was Theodosius,

⁵ A Frankish king, probably a vassal of the empire.

⁶ Fritigern was a Gothic leader, who, together with all his command, had deserted to Valens.

whose father had been executed at Carthage, for no worse crime than that of venerating the gods under whom Rome had grown from a petty village to become mistress of the world. For that ungrateful and unjust execution Gratian was morally responsible. However, the exigency was pressing and Gratian was still young and probably prudent and pliant enough to address a letter filled with such sentiments of patriotism, flattery, apology and promise, as were likely to propitiate and move the exiled duke. The latter was twelve years the senior of Gratian, his experience had been ripened by a long residence near the court of Constantinople, he knew from his father's fate how little dependence was to be placed upon the favour of princes, and he was either in a position to ask for terms, or Gratian was politic or penitential enough to offer them. These terms were that if he undertook to rescue the Eastern capital from its present peril, he should become its supreme sovereign. He was declared Augustus, January 19th, 379; his sovereignty embracing Mœsia, Thrace, Dacia, Macedonia, Egypt, and all Asia. Fixing his head-quarters at Thessalonica, Theodosius, in four campaigns, 379-82, effectually suppressed the Gothic insurrection. Many of the leaders were killed, Modar and Athanaric were won over, and their followers pacified, some of them accepting service in the legions and submitting to that very conscription and banishment from their native province, which had been one of the causes of their rebellion.

Delivered once more from the peril of insurrection, Gratian indulged in another of those dreams of false security which had already cost him four years of anxiety. Except upon the grounds that *christianity was embraced in order to discourage and destroy emperor-worship*, it is difficult to understand why sovereigns, who must have been aware how largely the provinces were impregnated with Gothic and other barbarian blood and how readily this fact led their inhabitants to revolt from any measures which tended to excite their religious or political prejudices, should have ventured upon the experiments which distinguished the reigns, not merely of Gratian, but of so many of the emperors of Rome, both before and after his time. In spite of an utter lack of unity among themselves, these most impolitic politicians were perpetually interfering with the religion of their subjects, some demanding worship to themselves, some, like Elagabalus, to the Sun, some, like Julian, to the ancient Greek gods, and some, as we are assured, like Gratian and Theodosius, to the Lord Jesus Christ. But so it was; local creeds, incapable, from the lack of any such agency as the modern newspaper press, of being either readily diffused or

readily discouraged, no doubt had much to do with this religious unrest. As the established (pagan) church owned half the lands and slaves of Europe, avidity may have also had something to do with it. There was always a party at the imperial court anxious for the salvation (and endowments) of their erring brethren in possession. On the other hand, the brethren in possession, unweariedly importuned the emperor for their adversaries' heads. Upon close inspection these agreeable sectarian pastimes will be found to fit many of the blanks bequeathed to us by ancient writers of Roman imperial history.

In 379 Gratian held his court at Milan, and although his boyish brother, Valentinian II., remained nominally the sovereign of Italy and the provinces before mentioned, Gratian really exercised supreme authority. Urged, no doubt, by the new-born zeal of Ambrose, ex-lawyer, ex-politician, and ex-pagan priest, but now the beloved bishop of the Milanese Christians, Gratian imprudently ordered the demolition of the statue of Victory, or Bona-Mater, which adorned the senate of Rome, and was the symbol, alike of its religion and its military glory.⁷ An ominous silence followed this act of sacrilege. Mistaking silence for indifference, Gratian, still under the influence of his legal and ecclesiastical friends in Milan, proceeded to the commission of a far bolder measure. Here he was, no doubt, largely influenced by Theodosius. This prince—whether from policy in dealing with the influential classes of Constantinople, who were now, we are assured, composed entirely of “Christians,” or bearing in mind the unfortunate fate of his father—had caused himself to be baptized a Christian in the first year of his reign. Before the Gothic insurrection was entirely suppressed, namely, in 381, he is said to have assembled an ecclesiastical council at the capital, confirmed the profession of faith and other proceedings at Nicæa, and issued several edicts against non-conformists. Gratian's measure was no less than the confiscation of all the lands, slaves, treasures, benefices, revenues, privileges, and livings of the Roman church throughout the Western empire, which he declared to be of right the property of the imperial fisc, and which he withdrew from its pagan, to bestow upon Christian incumbents, many of whom, like Ambrose and Augustine, had been recently converted from the polytheistic, the Julian or Augustan, the Bacchic, the Manichæan, and other idolatrous or mythological worships.⁸ But in

⁷ See the “Mother of God” in the Index to “The Worship of Augustus Cæsar.”

⁸ Gratian's confiscation of the property of the church is dated by Dr. Lardner, (iv, 455,) in A. D. 382. Lanciani, 172, dates the imperial decree in A. D. 383. Mithraic shrines continued to be erected in public places throughout Italy until A. D. 390. Baedeker's “Central Italy.” In Britain, probably also in Italy, they were erected so late as the fifth and sixth centuries.

preparing a smooth way for christianity in the East, by removing all the Christians and all the treasures of the empire to Constantinople, its founder had left a rough road for it in the West. The Goths of Mœsia might be placated; the Goths of Britain and Saxony could only be incensed.

The news of Gratian's edict spread through the provinces like wild-fire. It was a tocsin that summoned every malcontent to arms. This time the old school priests were with the rebels, and under their cautious advice an insurrection was quietly organized in Britain, whose remoteness and insular position afforded that secrecy and time for preparation, which were deemed essential to success. Meanwhile Gratian, who appeared to have had no suspicion of the coming storm, quietly journeyed with his court to Paris, amusing himself on the way with those idle pleasures of the chase, between which and the enactment of religious reforms, he appeared to divide the most of his time. The vast numbers who followed the standard of Maximus Magnus entirely forbid the notion that the insurgent army was of Britons alone.⁹ The numbers of women who joined it is an indication of its semi-religious organization. This peculiar character, and its subsequent safe landing and march to Paris, are evidences that it was encouraged and aided by the inhabitants of Gaul.

All being ready, the insurgents, in the year 383, clapped a crown upon the dull and dizzy head of Maximus and declaring him emperor of Rome, sworn to "the defence of Jupiter and of all the Gods," demanded to be led against the impious Gratian. The fleet was ready, the sea smooth, the wind fair, and countless friends stood ready to welcome and assist the rebels on the opposite shore. Maximus accepted the fatal distinction, took his boy, Victor, by the hand, harangued the troops to the point of military enthusiasm, and led the march to Dover. In a week's time this strange armament, which included not only the troops, the Roman-British and Roman-Gothic citizens, and the women, but also many of the Goths who had been driven beyond the Walls, and a fleet of Norse boats employed for the occasion, landed safely in Gaul. Here it was joined by additional numbers, and the incongruous host took up its march for Paris.

So successfully had the secret of this insurrection been preserved, that Gratian's first intimation of it was when Maximus was close to

⁹ Archbishop Usher computed the followers of Maximus at 30,000 soldiers, 100,000 citizens, 11,000 women of the noble classes, and 6000 of the plebian class. *Antiq. Brit. Eccl.*, 107-8. If any reliance can be placed upon these details, they indicate not merely a local insurrection, but a crusade.

Paris. The defenses and resources of the place were inadequate to resist such a force, there was no army within call, and it was difficult to determine whom to trust. Gratian had no resource but immediate flight, and so away he went, taking the road to Lyons, with the cavalry of Maximus in hot pursuit. Before they could overtake him, the unfortunate young man was, like Julius Cæsar, betrayed by one of his comes palatini. He was killed by Andragathius, commander of the advance guard of Maximus. Upon the arrival of the latter, all that was left of his noble and imperial rival was his lifeless body.

With military promptness, Maximus made the best use of his advantage, by immediately threatening to invade Italy. From this design he was dissuaded by Theodosius, who agreed to recognize him as emperor of the West, upon condition that he did not attempt to cross the Alps. Returning to Treves, where he fixed his headquarters,¹⁰ Maximus supported the ancient worship, both in Gaul and Britain, and proclaimed his son, Victor, as his colleague.¹¹ Tired of an inactive life, and perhaps urged on by those priests of polytheism who hoped for a restoration of the ancient rites in the central provinces, Maximus left Paris in 387 and, attended by a well-armed and numerous force, crossed the Alps and laid siege to Milan, where Valentinian II. held his court. Upon the flight of the latter to Thessalonica, Maximus captured the city and, after recruiting his army, marched on to Aquilæia, made that place his base of supplies, and thence sent an army into Pannonia. Meanwhile, Valentinian II. reached Theodosius, and the combined forces of these princes came up with and defeated the army of Maximus, near Siscia, on the Save. Maximus fled to Aquilæia, where, in 388, he was captured and executed; a fate that soon after overtook the innocent colleague whom he had left on his throne in Gaul. The prisoners taken at Siscia and Aquilæia were drafted into the imperial army; Theodosius assumed the sovereignty of the whole empire, renouncing to Valentinian only the petty throne of Milan; fresh-legions were ordered to Gaul and Britain; and in 389 the son of the murdered governor of Africa,¹² entered Rome in triumph, where

¹⁰ Gildas, I, 13.

¹¹ Maximus has been charged with the death of Priscillian, the "Christian" bishop of Avilar. Both of these statements appear to be untrue. Priscillian was put to death by one of his own followers. Rose, *Biog. Dic.* He was not a Christian, but a Manichæan. The edict of Diocletian, preserved by Hermogenes, only mentions Manichæans. Taylor, 249. At all events, Priscillian is said to have been condemned as heretical by the council of Saragossa, in 380.

¹² Theodosius had now become Augustus, Cæsar, and Sacratissimus Princeps.

we are told that during the same year,¹³ an obedient senate voted christianity to be the official religion of the state and bestowed the livings of the old church upon the priests of the new.

Thus ended the rebellion of Maximus. It was excited at Rome, organized in London, matured at Paris, carried to Milan, and finally suppressed at Aquilæia. Its origin was the confiscation of the pagan church property and benefices by Gratian; its culmination saw the ancient worship and the property of the church restored; and its suppression was marked by the official acceptance of christianity on the part of the Roman government.¹⁴ But although Maximus was suppressed, the dissatisfaction of the Goths was not appeased. No sooner had Theodosius resealed the youthful Valentinian upon his throne and left Milan for Constantinople, than Arbogastes, a Frankish general, the second in command of the Roman armies, rebelled against the new order of affairs, procured the assassination of Valentinian, in 392, and seated a Roman rhetorician, one Eugenius, upon the throne of the Cæsars. Among the first acts of the new monarch was the restoration of its property and livings to the pagan church and priesthood. Upon receiving information of these transactions, Theodosius made deliberate preparations for war, and in 394 marched through Hungary to Aquilæia, where Eugenius was intrenched, but which place proved as fatal to him as to Maximus. A few days later Theodosius again entered Rome in triumph and at once restored the church properties and livings to the Christian priests.¹⁵ It is from this date, therefore, that must be reckoned the definitive downfall of paganism and the adoption of "christianity" by the court of Rome.

¹³ Thackeray, *vit. Prudentius*, dates the official adoption of christianity in 384. Gibbon, chapter XXVIII, says after the first triumph of Theodosius, which would make it 389. In 393 Eugenius re-established the ancient worship. Zosimus, a contemporary author, says that christianity was restored and established after the defeat of Eugenius. This makes it 394. Consult Lanciani, "Pagan and Christian Rome," p. 39, for the consecration of the temples as "Christian" churches in 393.

¹⁴ The official acceptance of "christianity" in Rome does not imply its acceptance by the people of the provinces. This did not occur in Britain until after the sixth century.

¹⁵ Lanciani, 177.

CHAPTER VII.

THE REPUTED INVASION BY HENGIST AND Horsa.

Absence of Christian remains in Roman Britain—Murder of Valentinian II.—Theodosius becomes sole emperor—His death—Succession of his two children, Arcadius and Honorius—Sack of Rome by the Goths under Alaric—Troubles in Gaul—Withdrawal of the imperial troops from Britain—The Caledonians and Saxons of Britain occupy York and London—Britain falls quietly into Gothic hands and is not conquered by an invasion of Saxons—Exaggeration and perversion of the monkish chronicles—The Goths really conserved, rather than destroyed, the Roman government—Some cities of Britain remained Roman until the seventh century—Gothic captives sent by them as slaves to Rome—Accounts of Gildas, Nennius, and Bede discredited by archæologists—Intrinsic evidence of their falsity—Their mischievous influence.

IF there is any period in the remains of which the antiquarian might hope to search successfully for evidences of the appearance of christianity in Britain, that period is between the years 389 and 449, the first being Gibbon's date for the official promulgation of the new religion at Rome, the last being that assigned by Horsley for the withdrawal of the Roman legions from Britain to the Continent. Yet, as shown in another part of this work, no such remains have been found. Their absence can be accounted for on either of three grounds; first, the symbols of "early christianity" may not have differed sufficiently from those of earlier religions to be distinguished from them; second, the inscriptions or insignia of early christianity may have been originally so interwoven or mixed up with those of other religions as to have rendered the publication of this fact inexpedient. The monuments dug up in the Rue Mathurin appear to furnish an instance of this character; third, the remoteness and polytheistic proclivities of the islanders may have rendered it impolitic to attempt the evangelization of Britain at this period.

It may be safely surmised that the legions whom Theodosius despatched to Britain were not composed of those Gothic polytheists whose fraternizations with the Roman soldiers had laid the grounds for so many mutinies, desertions, and rebellions. These guardians of Britain's peace were very much more likely to have been drafted from

Syria, Egypt, or Africa. Whoever they were, the new-comers were certainly not Christians, for they have left no Christian memorials behind them, indeed "christianity" as yet was chiefly confined to the intellectual classes of the principal imperial cities and had hardly more than made its appearance among the ranks from whom the provincial legions were drawn. To have introduced the new religion of Rome to the idolatrous troops quartered in Britain would have been a dangerous experiment. Britain was not Syria, and any attempt on the part of Theodosius to transfer the pagan church-livings of Britain, to the ministers of christianity, or worse still, to demand worship for his own image, as he did at Antioch in 387, would have been instantly followed by another rebellion of the people.

Indeed, beyond keeping the Caledonians and Saxons at a distance, the functions of the imperial government, whether civil or religious, were exerted so faintly during the interval between the revolt of Maximus and the final withdrawal of the troops, that some writers have imagined that a sort of republic filled up this æra and have peopled it with that race of aboriginal Britons who in point of fact had been entirely extirpated two centuries previously. Briton is a designation to which the inhabitants of the island at this period had about as much right as an American of to-day has to the name of Indian.

From the death of the ill-starred prince of Milan Theodosius plucked both the sweets of revenge and of undivided empire. Valentinian was the last of the royal house that had authorized the execution of Theodosius Saxonius, and, in the autumn of 394, Theodosius I. became both *de facto* and *de jure* sole emperor of the Roman world. He lived just four months to enjoy this elevation and died in the following January, leaving the empire divided between Arcadius, aged twelve, and Honorius, aged eleven. In conformity with the father's will, the former, under the guardianship of Rufinus, took the Eastern empire; the latter, under that of Stilicho, took the Western.

The invasion of Italy, first by the Goths under Alaric, next by the Mecklenburgers under Rada Gaisus,¹ and again by the Goths under Alaric, the flight of Honorius and his court to Ravenna and the capture and sack of Rome by the Goths, all occurred during the first decade of the fifth century, and put the seal to that feudalization of the empire which began with the birth of the Roman hierarchy, and only ended with its dissolution. Henceforth we shall not have to deal with Britain through the empire, but with the empire through Britain.

¹ Rada-Gaisus was the name of one of the deities worshipped by the coast tribes. Mascou, "*Hist. Ger.*," VIII, 14. He died A.D. 406. "*The Worship of Augustus*," p. 196.

The imperial government now governed only the lords whom it had created. It had no longer any direct relations with the people. It had long lived in an atmosphere of myths and in unison with its surroundings, it had almost become a myth itself. The ease with which the imperial insignia were assumed by upstarts all over the Roman world is a warning that the possession of these insignia should not be regarded as the evidence of real power; they belonged to a suzerainty bereft of armies or treasure. The real elements of power had long been in the hands of the provincial lords, who as a rule only refrained from divorcing their provinces from the empire, out of respect for its religious character and because there was practically nothing to be gained by secession.² The child-like confidence with which these events and circumstances have been regarded as the consequence of "successive waves of barbarians pushing westward from the north-east in search of new lands," would be entertaining did it not serve to wholly conceal and pervert the truth of history.

Some of the troops with whom the province of Britain was reinforced during the reign of Theodosius were sent to the aid of Gaul during the regency of Stilicho. In 420 the remaining forces of the Western empire in Britain were withdrawn to the Continent and the proconsul was left to his own resources. One of his first movements was the abandonment of York and concentration of his forces in the southern part of the province; whereupon the Caledonians and Saxons advanced and occupied the deserted city. In 443 the Romano-Gothic lords in Britain appealed to Ætius, the Roman proconsul of Gaul, for military aid to repel the barbarians. In 444, or according to Horsley 446, they made a similar appeal; and although these applications were answered by the appearance of forces that served for a brief interval to turn back the Caledonians and suppress the insurgents who were overrunning the province, the Roman troops were again withdrawn, this time never to return to Britain.

All was now over. The Western empire was itself sunk into decay; since the revolt of Maximus its authority had been almost unfelt in Britain, and for more than half a century the Romano-Goths had lived in a state of feudal independence which the imperial govern-

² In point of fact, two secessions occurred in Britain. In 407 Gratianus Municeps established an independent government in that island. Being soon after killed, he was succeeded by Constantine, a legionary soldier, who, after seizing the government, crossed over into Gaul and, with the aid of the Franks and other barbarians, brought that province also into subjection. He fixed his court at Arles, where he was defeated and killed by an imperial force under command of count Constantius. His son, Constans, whom he had created Cæsar, was killed at Vienne by count Gerontius. Bede, I, 11.

ment had grown less and less disposed to disturb. The proconsul of Gaul had as much as he could do to preserve his authority in his own province. In 405-6 the Vandals (Goths) had risen; in 412, a Roman general, Jovinus, revolted from his allegiance to the empire, assumed the purple in Gaul and rewarded his Gothic allies with the grant of that territory (valley of the Rhone,) which they named the Kingdom of Burgundy; and in 419, the Goths occupied not only Burgundy but also almost the entire southern portion of Gaul. Finally in 451 a new and formidable enemy, tempted by the distractions of the empire and the hope of spoil, overran the whole of northern Europe and entered Gaul near the city of Chalons-sur-Marne. These were the Huns under Attila.

The departure of the troops from Britain was not long afterwards followed by the advance of the Goths from York to London. That some accession of Scythians,³ Saxons, Angles, Jutes, Franks, Frisians, and other riparian tribes from the Continent, occurred at this period, is not denied; on the contrary, the Hunnish invasion of northern Europe renders it extremely likely. What is denied is that they came otherwise than as exiles seeking refuge with their kinsmen, who were already in the peaceable and almost entire possession of an undefended province. As the Goths advanced, the proconsular forces retreated further south, and within easier reach of succour from Gaul. We are told that in the sixth or seventh century the king of Denmark, Ivan Vidfami, rebuilt London,⁴ whose battlements had probably been dismantled by the Romans at the time when they fell back upon the coast. The monkish chronicles say nothing about Ivan Vidfami, nor do they credit the Goths with having rebuilt anything. According to them it was all destruction. For example, Cynewolf in describing the fall of Anderida, mentions the princely temples with roofs of "gold" and filled with furniture of silver and gems, that were set afire, the baths exploding in flames and steam and the Saxon chieftains decked with spoil and drunk with Roman wine. As though confirming this view Elton says: "A few ruins near Pevensey were long shown to travellers as all that remained of the noble city." It may

³ "Scythians" are distinctly included among the conquerors of Britain by Nennius. As the tract ascribed to this author is an alteration or forgery of the twelfth century, it is hardly worth while to search into the meaning of the phrase in this place. However, as Bede makes a similar statement, the phrase was probably taken from the original but now lost story, upon which both of these writers built their chronicles of Britain. Anciently all that part of Scythia now embraced in the governments of Esthonia, Petersburg, and Novgorod, was in the hands of the Goths, or Sacæ.

⁴ Ragnar Ladbok's Saga, cc. 10-19.

be added of Wroxeter, a Roman provincial city of the first class, that nothing remained to mark its site but a petty village. Kinchester, Lincoln and Weston must have been considerable cities, judging from the extent of their Roman remains; so was Cirencester at the source of the Thames. There is little more left of them than their ashes. The devastation committed in these places is not denied, but it must be attributed to another occasion than a German invasion of the fifth century, which never took place, and to another motive than a ruthless desire to destroy, which never existed. During the entire interval between 366 and 446 the island was a scene of feudal anarchy, in which the Roman forces from Gaul alternately appeared and vanished and Roman civilization flickered and expired. In the foreground stood a mass of discontented provincials, that is to say, Romans and Goths and Romano-Goths, who again and again fraternized with each other, revolted against the suzerainty of Rome, and overthrew the altars of the impious Augustan religion. In the background, always prepared to move to the front, were the Caledonians and the wild Norse tribes, who were related to the provincials, and shared their prejudices, but to whom the prospect of plunder was always necessary to awaken their sense of kinship or to stimulate their latent energies. These and the Romans themselves, who dismantled the fortifications which they abandoned, were the authors of the devastations that occurred during the fifth century; and not the mythical Hengist or Horsa. To these principal agencies may be added the revolt of Maximus, which could hardly have occurred without some resistance on the part of the Augustan priests and their adherents; a resistance that would naturally be followed by attacks upon their temples and other places of security or refuge. In these attacks the fury of the assailants may often have overcome their prudence, and contrary to their own interests and intentions, both temples, villas and cities, may have been sacked or burnt to the ground. All revolts are attended with bloodshed and religious revolts are commonly the bloodiest.

Twenty feet beneath the cities of York, London, Wroxeter, Kinchester, Lincoln, Weston, Cirencester, etc., there is a Roman city, utterly destroyed; but these cities did not fall at the same time nor from the same causes. Some fell during the religious wars of the second and third centuries, some during the Romano-Gothic insurrections of the third and fourth centuries, some beneath the hands of retreating Romans in the fourth century, some were possibly destroyed by the Goths when they advanced from Valentia to Britan-

nia Prima, while others held out as Roman cities until the seventh or eighth centuries, to fall at last by the hands of an entirely new class of contestants or religious bigots.⁵ But there is no warrant at all for attributing to the Goths of Britain, as some writers have done, the same sort of devastation which was said to have been committed by their brethren in Mœsia. Says St. Jerome, who claims to have been an eye-witness of these acts of violence: "Little was left except the sky and the earth, and after the destruction of the cities and the extirpation of the Roman race the land was overgrown with thick forests and inextricable brambles." It has been the policy of the Church to suppress all mention of emperor-worship and the revolts which it occasioned in the provinces. To account for these revolts it was obliged to invent the Barbarian invasions and to ascribe all the devastation and cruelties of the former to the latter. When we consider the abominable form of idolatry which the new Church was engaged in uprooting, there was much excuse for these fictions, but there is no necessity to keep them up any longer.

The general conduct and policy of the Goths and dissenting Romans was not to destroy, but rather to conquer and conserve. There was no motive for destruction. In the blind fury of battle and especially where the resistance was prolonged or accompanied by circumstances that excited the anger of the belligerents, the accounts transmitted to us may be sufficiently faithful, but such resistance was not always nor even generally offered. Many cities made no resistance to the insurgents, others surrendered upon terms. The great care which the revolutionists took to keep the communities intact and the privilege which they accorded the Roman portion of them to live under their own laws, affords a sufficient assurance that, generally speaking, the latter were neither tortured nor exterminated. In the course of a graphic picture which he draws of the occupation of Britain by the Saxons, Gibbon, III, 620, says they "violated without remorse the most sacred objects of the Christian worship." The numerous archæological discoveries which have been made since this historian penned his immortal treatise on the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, enable us with some confidence to substitute in this passage the word "Roman," for "Christian." The temples that fell at Anderida and elsewhere were temples of Augustus, not of Christ; the bishops who discreetly retired with their holy relics into Wales and Armorica were bishops of the pagan, not the Christian church;

⁵ Gibbon; Savigny; Sir F. Palgrave, I, vi; Du Bos, II, 333, 524; D'Acher, Specileg., XI. 345.

and the sacred objects which the Saxons seized and appropriated, many of which are in our museums to-day, bear not one of them a distinctively Christian mark. After the Gothic risings and the suppression of Roman imperial authority the spoils which had been taken by the former were partly employed to repay the jarls of Norway and Denmark who had furnished ships, men and arms to the rebels. Many of these spoils still survive in the antiquarian collections of Scandinavia. Others of similar character are in the museums of Britain. They consist of Roman gold and silver coins, jewelry, golden bowls and vases, fibulæ, precious glassware, gold-mounted swords and harness, and a great variety of other articles. A recent writer, Mr. Du Chaillu, has strangely mistaken these relics for specimens of Norse handiwork. Their Roman workmanship and origin are so obvious that his opinion on this point needs no further refutation.

In the religious wars of Britain during the fourth century, to which period we have ventured to assign many of the relics of devastation which have rewarded archæological research, the destructive acts were not confined to the insurgents; similar acts were also committed by the troops. As the former had neither stone altars to be defaced, nor temples to be overthrown, the troops satiated their animosity in blood, violence, and the sale of captives. The insurgent towns, whether betrayed or surprised, were always ruined. The people who were not cut down were enthralled and sold in the slave marts of the Continent, the women were foully treated, the aged and infants were left to perish. Many a Gothic settlement between the Walls was destroyed in these forays. Smoking ruins, pools of blood, disfigured corpses, the agonized cries of the wounded, and a troop of horse retreating in the distance, driving before them a herd of cattle laden with young women, boys and other spoil, told the piteous story. Indeed it was the sight of some Northumbrian Goths captured probably in a sally from one of the several Roman towns which still held out at this period, that excited the pity of Pope Gregory and put him upon the design of introducing christianity into Gothic Britain. These slaves were children, who about the year 580, were exposed for sale in the public mart of Rome. Being told they were Angles, Gregory is reported to have exclaimed: "Non Angli sed Angeli si forent christiani." "If they were Christians they would be angels, not Angles."

Upon a review of the various evidences which relate to Britain from the fourth to the sixth or seventh century, it appears that the practical sovereignty of the Island passed, almost without a struggle, from the hands of the imperial government, or its agents, or vassals, into those

of a number of petty Gothic chieftains, who occupied the places of the departed Romans and ruled in the names of their emperors; that some of the Roman cities remained independent of either Gothic or imperial government and continued to practise the ancient religion of Rome until the seventh century; and that the so-called Anglo-Saxon invasion is essentially mythical.⁶

The account of this invasion as given by Gildas says nothing about the Anglo-Saxons and other Goths who had inhabited Caledonia and Britain from the most ancient times; nor of the subdivision and feudal government of Britain; nor of the Count of the Saxon shore; nor of the insurrections under Carausius and other Gothic chieftains; nor of the Augustan religion, which provoked them; nor of the Gothic conquest or occupation of Iestland, Saxony, Frisia, and Normandy; nor of Theodosius Saxonius; nor whence he derived his name; nor of the revolt of Maximus; nor, in short, of any other circumstances which modern research has rescued from the ashes in which the false chronicles of the monks were planted. The work attributed to Gildas contains 102 printed pages, of which six are devoted to the preface, seventeen to "history," and seventy-nine to rhapsody. The preface and rhapsody do not contain any information, true or false, that is of the slightest value. The seventeen pages of "history" begin with the introduction of the Sun into Britain during the reign of Tiberius, that is to say, before the island was conquered by the Romans. This Sun is explained to mean Jesus Christ. Then follows an account of the apocryphal martyrs of St. Albans and Carlisle, the first of whom crossed the Thames dryshod whilst the "waters stood abrupt on either side." Pursuing this feeble romance to a rapid termination, we are informed that Gurthrigern, "the British king," a purely mythical creation, invited the Saxons, "whom, when absent, they dreaded more than death itself" (why absent and dreaded, if this was their first appearance?) to come to Britain and "live, as it were, under the same roof." The Saxons came in three vessels, landed on the east coast, proved "successful" against the Romans, and were followed by others, together with whom they ravaged and conquered the island.

Bede is more diffuse. Britain, anciently Albion, was peopled from Gaul. At some later period the Picts from Scythia⁷ were driven by

⁶ Lappenberg, Kemble, Wright, and many other eminent antiquarians, concur in regarding as mythical both the alleged appeal of the Romanized Britons to the Anglo-Saxon leaders and the alleged invasion by Hengist and Horsa. They contend that no such events took place.

⁷ Elsewhere it is shown that all the coasts of northern Scythia, that is to say, of the Baltic, were occupied by the Goths.

stress of weather to Ireland, whose inhabitants, the Scots, advised them to settle in England, the northern part of which they accordingly occupied, taking with them wives from Ireland. Then follows a brief mention of the conquests of Julius Cæsar and Claudius, an apocryphal introduction of christianity in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, by a bishop in whose name we recognize a pagan priest that flourished some two generations later; the usurpation of Carausius; the martyrdom of St. Alban shortly after his conversion from paganism; the revolt of Maximus, "a man of valour and probity and worthy to be an emperor, if he had not broken the oath of allegiance which he had taken"; the death of Gratian; the quarrel between Pelagius and Julianus, two pagan priests, under the emperor Maximus, in the fourth century, who were anachronically deprived of their bishoprics by St. Augustine, under the emperor Maurice, in the sixth century; the usurpations of Gratianus Municeps and Constantine; the sack of Rome by Alaric; the insurrection of the Scots and Picts; the petitions of the "Britons" to Roman Gaul for help; the arrival of a legion on two occasions; its final departure; the last despairing appeal to Ætius; the invitation of king Vortigern to the Angles or Saxons, and the dramatic arrival of the latter in "three long ships." These "pagans," entering into a league with the Picts, turned upon the too confiding Britons, (Romans,) slew their priests before the altars, overturned public as well as private edifices, drove the people into the mountains or beyond the sea, and then returned "home to their own settlements" in triumph. About 429 two Christian bishops, coming over from Gaul with numerous limbs of saints and other holy relics, were obstructed by demons, who raised a storm against them in mid-channel. The waves having been allayed with a few drops of holy water, and the demons dispersed by a well-directed prayer, the bishops landed, challenged their pelagian adversaries to a public debate, utterly overwhelmed them with "the written testimonies of famous writers," and commenced to work their relics. A blind girl was restored to sight, a broken leg was instantly made whole, and the British army, led by one of the relic-workers, obtained a miraculous victory over the pagans. Eighteen years afterwards similar miracles are performed. Then, lightly skipping over an interval of a century and a half, we are conducted to the apostolic mission of that servant of God and of the emperor Maurice, the sainted Augustine.

Bede and Alcuin both allude to a writer called Gildas, whose name afterwards sinks into oblivion until it is revived by Geoffry of Monmouth in the twelfth century, by which time a book imputed to him

had made its appearance. Judging from what is imputed to Gildas by those who cite him previous to the twelfth century, Mr. Wright is of the opinion that originally "the book was forged by some Anglo-Saxon or foreign priest of the seventh century." During the five centuries following this original forgery, the book was frequently amplified and reforged, until it attained its present form. "The whole is a fable created probably during the latter part of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. . . . We have no information relating to its writer which merits the slightest degree of credit." There are two manuscripts extant, one of which Mr. Wright assigns to the early part of the thirteenth century, the other to the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century.⁸

Bede is believed to have been born in 672 and to have died in 735. He was an honest and worthy monk of the monastery of St. Paul at Yarrow on the Tyne. He entered this establishment whilst still a youth and resided there during the remainder of his life. Considering the times in which he lived his works prove him to have been a priest of more than ordinary culture and attainments. His sincerity cannot be doubted, but his information concerning the Anglo-Saxons was three hundred years old, and—as the monuments incontestably prove—it was hopelessly wrong and defective. His work, which of course is written in Latin, appears to have been completed in the year 731. The manuscript now in the public library of Cambridge is a transcript dated 737, and with all its imperfections it is the most ancient and in some senses valuable relic of British history which has reached us from the Middle Ages.⁹

With regard to the tract imputed to Nennius and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the two works which are chiefly relied upon for the details of the so-called Anglo-Saxon invasion and the origin of the heptarchical kingdoms, it would be a waste of time to criticize them. They are rank forgeries, committed some seven centuries posterior to the date of the pretended invasion. It is the opinion of Mr. Wright that two prologues to the tract of Nennius are spurious and not older than the twelfth century. "The book contains many marks of having been an intentional forgery." The oldest ms. states the year in which it was written to be 5th Edmund (976), but it is probably in fact more than a century newer. The ms., Harl., No. 3859, belongs probably to the beginning of the twelfth century.

⁸ Thomas Wright, *Biographia Britannica Literaria*, London, 1842, 8vo.

⁹ Mabillon (*Analecta*, i, 398) points out some alterations which have been made in the MS of Bede's work.

Of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle there are seven extant manuscripts whose narratives end respectively in A.D. 977, 1001, 1058, 1066, 1070, 1080, and 1154. Even with regard to the earlier periods, no two of them agree. Their idioms, handwriting, dates, etc., prove them to be patched forgeries of the eleventh or twelfth centuries, probably done in Rome and wholly unworthy of credit. To regard these fabulous chronicles as historical we must first destroy every landmark, every edifice, public or private, and every tomb; we must burn the archæological remains of the Romans and Goths and light the fires with the Roman histories, the Itinerary of Antonine, and the *Notitia Imperii*; we must ignore the Roman laws and religions, fling into the sea our collections of Roman coins, and stamp out the Latin language itself.

It is abundantly evident that Britain was not evangelized as the monks narrate; it is abundantly evident that it was not conquered as they narrate; it is abundantly evident that it was not governed as they narrate. Odin or Woden, from whom they say Hengist and Horsa descended in the fourth generation, was the Tamil name for Buddha and the Gothic name for the Greek god Bacchus or Mercury, whence the English Wednesday and the French Mercredi.¹⁰ Hengist and Horsa are the Gothic words for stallion and mare. Upon this myth of the Scythian desert and the Norse fjords, the medieval monks superimposed other myths, which, coming from Hindustan, Persia, Assyria, Egypt, Greece and Gaul, gradually made their way to the markets of Alexandria and Rome, whence with other merchandise, they were diffused throughout the imperial world. Myths upon myths, ancient trash piled upon still more ancient trash, the rubbish of centuries watered by ignorance and warmed by brutish zeal, this is what has been carelessly accepted by the modern world as the groundwork for a history of Britain and the construction of its national policy. It is time it were brushed away.

¹⁰ Tacitus, who wrote nearly four centuries previous to the alleged Hengist and Horsa, who were "fourth in descent from Buddha," mentions the *Badu-henna*, or forest of Buddha, in the Low Countries. *Annals*, IV, 73.

CHAPTER VIII.

MONUMENTS OF ROMAN CIVILIZATION.

Language, Religion, and law—Barbarian patches upon the Roman tongue—Subsequent regrowth of classical Latin—Eclecticism of the Roman religion transferred to christianity—Its happy susceptibility to change and improvement is gradually fitting christianity for universal acceptance—The Civil Law, its origin and history—Written and oral law—Law of the Commonwealth—Of the empire—The spirit of the law swept away by the hierarchy, whilst its forms were retained—Abolition of the Comitia, or House of Commons—Imperial “Constitutions”—Proculians and Pegasians—Eminent jurists of the empire—The age of Constantine and miracles—Virtual extinction of the legal profession—Compilations of Gregorius and Hermogenes—Theodosian Code—Visigothic Code—Code of Justinian—The Digest, or Pandects—The Institutes—Alleged Reform of the Calendar by Dionysius Exiguus—Pretended loss of the Pandects and its recovery at Amalfi—Reasons why it fell under the ban of the Church—The law of Britain—Roman law of the Commonwealth—Anglo-Saxon Codes—Roman law of the Empire—Canon law—General influence of the Civil Law—The Common Law.

WHEN the Church mangled and disfigured the remains of Roman history, it forgot its own doctrine of immortality, it stabbed the body in the vain hope to destroy the spirit. The fragments of Livy and Tacitus which it has flung to posterity may suffice to fill a child's catechism, but will never satisfy the requirements of men. Those who would consult the spirit of Roman history will not search for it in the mutilated pages spared by the monks, but in the silent ashes of Rome's language, religion and law. These institutions survived the rule of both Cæsars and popes, they exist to this day, they shape our present life, and are destined to influence the affairs of the world unto the remotest future.¹

The barbarian risings disfigured the Roman language with four great coarse patches: the Gothic, Slavic, Hunnish and Arabic, of which only the first two possess any considerable influence at the present day. The modern languages of Italy, Gaul, and Britain, consist of Latin mingled with Gothic, or Gaelic, or both; of Spain, Latin with

¹ The Levitical code may have been admirably adapted to the people for whom it was framed and the time it was promulgated; the same may be said of the Canon law, indeed of all legal codes; but what stone of which the modern temple of Liberty is constructed bears any other mark than that of republican Rome?

Gothic and Arabic; and of Germany, Latin with Gothic and Slavic. Of course, there are other elements in these languages, but we are here speaking of the most prominent ones. The barbarian patches, once so thick as to almost entirely conceal the Latin beneath, are now so worn away that one who speaks a Romance tongue may traverse more than one-half the globe without fear of having to deal with a totally unfamiliar language. Like the Gothic letter, which, within the present generation, has been cast aside at Stockholm and Berlin, like the Gothic legends which we have erased from palimpsests for the sake of the more precious writings beneath, the Gothic patches upon the Roman language are being gradually removed, because we have discovered the superior value of the language which they deformed. This superiority does not consist in mere sonorousness or fluency, albeit these qualities have not a little to do with a choice of languages, but mainly in the greater precision of the Latin in the expression of thought. The language of imperial Rome was made up of several others, Indian, Egyptian, Grecian, Etruscan and Punic, each of which embodied the thoughts of many generations of men, and a wide experience in government and the arts.

The language of the Romans was that of a people who had once been free, and who still boasted a class of citizens, alike public spirited, ingenious and refined. In the thirteenth century, when the Romance nations began to extricate themselves from the dominion of Rome, and assume an independent existence, it was natural that they should each have wished to sing in their peculiar tongue the joyous theme of their emancipation; but when these nations found that they had to seek in the remains of Rome for a system of jurisprudence, a literature, and a knowledge of the arts, it was inevitable that they should again accept the Roman language and accept more and more of it as time advanced. The Englishman of to-day can scarcely read and understand the English of Chaucer. The difference will be found to consist chiefly in the relinquishment of Gothic words and phrases for Latin ones; and although this Latinization of the Romance languages has proceeded with far less rapidity in other countries than in England, it has made its mark in all of them. If the European world ever has a common language again, it is safe to predict that it will not be Volapuk, but Latin, with perhaps an infusion of that one of the several Romance tongues, which conquest, commerce, or colonization, may most widely disseminate.

In other portions of this work, the strange developement of the Roman religions and their influence upon modern affairs is more than

once suggested. In the present place it is only necessary to recall one striking characteristic of these religions: their capacity of development. We have been taught that the earlier polytheism which Rome derived from Etruria and Greece and which the Romans themselves ascribed to the institutes of Romulus and Numa always remained the same;² but this is not only the very reverse of the truth, it is a very superficial view of the whole subject. Continual development was the most striking characteristic of the Roman mythology. The Brahmin, the Buddhist, the Egyptian, the Hebrew codes of sacred and ceremonial law, were fixed, and the religions of those peoples remained unchanged. The canons of polytheism were not fixed; and the Roman religion changed with every new discovery in astronomy and with every important phase of social and political growth.

The Roman republic was eclectic; its people, its laws, its mythology, came from every quarter of the earth. Its religious ceremonial³ differed in every province, and its people were split up into as many different sects as christendom is to-day. This is what makes our modern "pantheons" so perplexing; they jumble together, without order, the myths of all the ages, and all the provinces, and gravely ask us to believe that this anachronical and ill-assorted mass was the religion of every Roman. As well combine all the tenets of all the sects of christianity in every age and represent the lot to be the creed of every Christian! It was their religious eclecticism which above all things enabled the Romans to readily amalgamate with other peoples and which rendered practicable the enormous expansion of their empire. When this religious freedom was curtailed (for it was not ended) by the establishment of a State religion, (emperor-worship,) amalgamation became more difficult and territorial expansion ceased. The surrounding nations had been one by one conquered with the sword, but they could not be so readily forced to accept a strange religion. To the reaction against emperor-worship and the revival of that eclecticism which had always distinguished the religion of Rome, the Christian church is largely indebted for its early growth. When, during the

² Adam's Roman Antiquities.

³ Livy, in speaking of Cære, a Punic city in Etruria, calls it *Sacrarium populi Romani, diversorium. sacerdotum ac receptaculum sacrorum*. From the name of this holy place we have the word ceremony. It also points to some of the immediate sources (Phœnicia and Etruria) of Rome's earlier religious belief and ritual. During the Commonwealth the religion of Rome was largely modified by that of Greece. It was further modified and split into two great divisions, when, added to the Greek theology, the deification and worship of Julius Cæsar and Augustus were by law made a portion of its creed and confession of faith.

eleventh century, the Church felt strong enough to cast aside eclecticism, it did so, and the result was that the new religion ceased either to grow or to spread. When the fanatic hands of the clergy were removed from its throat and the Reformation reëstablished the eclecticism that had contributed so powerfully to its original success, it began to grow and spread again. Liberty and christianity appear to be complementary.

That portion of the Civil law which the Romans acquired from Etruria, Egypt and Greece, has long ceased to be of interest, except to a limited class of antiquarians. The ordinary student of history, the lawyer, the publicist, the philosopher, begins his investigations into Roman jurisprudence, with the laws of the Republic. As the outcome of a free people and the result of a long and varied national experience, these laws and institutes are of the highest interest to a growing world. Unfortunately, with the exception of a few statutes gathered from historical works, themselves in a fragmentary condition, this jurisprudence is all lost; it was destroyed partly in the reign of the Julian emperors and partly in that of Justinian and his immediate successors. The basis of these laws was the Twelve, originally Ten Tables, reduced to writing about A. U. 300. The scope of this legal relic was both political and legislative, it related to freedom, the right of assemblage and appeal, the settlement of the relations between the patricians and plebians, the regulation of judicial proceedings, and the duties of magistrates.⁴ Upon the basis of the Twelve Tables was reared, first, the written, and second, the oral, law of the Commonwealth. Of these in their order.

The written law consisted of enactments by the *comitia centuriata*, a popular assemblage, or House of Commons, summoned by patrician magistrates. The general legislative functions of this assemblage were supplemented in A. U. 305 by the *comitia tributa*, a popular assemblage summoned by plebian magistrates, (tribunes,) whose enactments formed the second portion of the law. As a makeweight for the constitution of the new *comitia* conceded by the patricians, the plebians accepted the decrees of the senate, *senatus consulta*, as the third portion of the Law, provided such decrees were not nullified or vetoed by the tribunes. Few general laws were passed by either of the (successive) *comitias* or Houses of Commons; their sessions were chiefly devoted to the elections of the higher magistrates, trials for treason, and to foreign affairs, functions that toward the close of the Com-

⁴ See Twelve Tables collected by Jacques Godefroy and published in Michelet's *Hist. Rom. Rep.*, Appendix, XXIII.

monwealth were exercised by the senate before they fell into the hands of dictators and gods.

The oral law embraced the *mores majorum*, or digest of customs relative to private rights, derived chiefly from ancient usages under the Twelve Tables, together with other usages of the Commonwealth not expressed in the written law; the code of practice, *edictus perpetuæ*, which the prætors, or judges, were required to adopt and publicly declare each year at the commencement of their judicial functions, and which varied but little from time to time; and the commentaries, juridical principles and opinions, contained in the decisions of the bench, or the treatises of eminent lawyers.⁵

Theoretically, the various official powers which Julius Cæsar and Augustus absorbed into the imperial and pontifical office, put an end to the entire system of Roman law; practically, the system was retained, but perverted. The forms remained, the essence was absorbed. The imperial absorption of power, and its assumption of infallibility, rendered the processes of law little more than a mockery; and yet men are sometimes so well contented with a shadow in place of the substance, that this mockery has been kept up in Rome almost to the present day; for it is only within recent years that the Italians have shaken off the chains of an unreal and tyrannical imposture, to accept the more beneficent, if less pretentious, rule of a flesh-and-blood sovereign. Many writers have expressed the deepest regret that the forensic literature of the empire is lost. We can see little to deplore in the circumstance. The science of law can gain nothing from perusing either the edicts of gods, or the glosses of their parasites and panders. What was valuable in the Roman law came from the acts of a free people and a free Commons and Senate, acts which were afterwards reflected in the commentaries of that class of jurisconsults, known as Proculians or Pegasians, who, in the faces of the most absolute and bloody tyrants that ever encumbered the earth, had the astounding temerity to proclaim and uphold the principles of freedom and the spirit of justice. These principles have survived. We have them in the precepts of Paulus, Gaius, Papian, Ulpian, and Modestinus, men who held aloft the torch of legal science long after it had become a criminal offence to question the slightest dictum of hierarchical rule.

The establishment of the empire added a new class of materials to the body of the Roman law. As the *comitia tributa*, or second House of Commons, declined and faded out of sight, the senate, which had become little more than an assembly of patricians to formally enact

⁵ Also the Canon law and Code of procedure. See Livy, ix, 46.

the imperial will, increased its menial functions. At length the *leges* and *plebiscita* entirely ceased, the House of Commons expired, and the decrees of a mock senate alone remained of the ancient form of legislation. To these decrees were subsequently added the imperial constitutions, or ordinances of the hierarchy, the orders in council, (*rescripta*,) and, in some instances, the decisions of the *prætors* and *ædiles* and of the provincial *proconsuls* and *proprætors*. These were supplemented by the opinions of *jurisconsults*, among whom the imperialists were called *Cassians* or *Sabinians*, the whole constituting the body of the law which prevailed during the empire. In the reign of Constantine the legal profession itself sank into oblivion. Ignorant credulity usurped the place of reason, and pretended miracles were substituted for the deliberate judgments of the bench. Those silly people who sigh for the extinction of lawyers, and who may be interested to learn how legal problems were decided without them, will find some interesting passages in the pages of Socrates, Sozomen, Eusebius, and other ecclesiastical writers.

It was perhaps with the design to save the crumbling, though yet vast edifice of the Civil law, from complete destruction, that the compilations which we are about to mention, were prepared. At all events, they practically served that purpose, and although much of the framework and finer portions of the law are lost, enough of the structure was preserved to render it, in the Middle Ages, a potent fortress to check the advances of tyranny and protect the roots of free institutions from entire destruction. The position of the law during the early empire happens to be better known to us than during any other period, because most of the literary fragments that have reached us belong to that æra. On this account it has received more attention than it really deserves. Eminent pleaders and patrons appeared before the senate, to raise their voices in behalf of accused persons; but what reason or what legal principles could hope to prevail against the known wish of the reigning hierarch? Eminent lawyers wrote treatises which bravely asserted the legal principles of the republic; but unhappily they were without the slightest power to reanimate them. The Roman House of Commons was overthrown, the tribunes had long since expiated with their heads their crime of liberty, and superstition was busily erecting behind the throne of the Cæsars a gloomy scaffold, upon which was yet to be spilt the blood of twelve centuries of freemen.

During the Commonwealth the code of practice had continually improved. To this brilliant period, and not to the murky twilight of the

ninth century, do we owe our institute of Trial by Jury. During the empire, the code of practice, which was now no longer a growth, but a survival, was rearranged by Salius Julianus, approved by the emperor Hadrian, and petrified by a Perpetual edict of the complaisant senate. So effectually was all developement of the law arrested by sacred imperialism, that lawyers no longer quoted the decisions or dicta of the prætors. They preferred to depend on the principles contained in the works of the old jurisconsults. It was the last effort of reason to make headway against the hierarchy, and it failed. For all this, such is the wonderful tenacity and longevity of free institutions, that many of the ancient principles found their way into the Pandects. The race of lawyers had died out, their profession was dishonoured, their learning despised, but the eternal principles of justice which they had wrought into a code and sheltered from violence in the mysterious jargon of their craft, was preserved for the use of a distant and thankless posterity. The latest of these legal treatises are those of the Proculians, who flourished during the interval from the Antonines to Alexander Severus, and whose names have been already mentioned. Their legal principles do not belong to their own times, but to the dead republic, whose dirge they sang and whose spirit they embalmed. From this period to the fifth century what little remained of forensic culture in the Roman empire seems to have been transferred to the provinces, for we hear little of it in Rome. Early in that century two legal collections were made, chiefly of imperial edicts and rescripts, or Orders in Council, from Hadrian to Constantine, the one by Gregorius, the other by Hermogenes, whose respective names they still bear. These compilations were supplemented by the Theodosian code, said to have been published in 438 by order of the emperor Theodosius II., and containing only the laws promulgated after the revival of a republican religion, together with some fragments of the earlier collections.⁶ Among these laws are to be found the edicts of Theodosius I., establishing and ordering the observance of the new religion throughout the empire, deposing the bishops and priests of the old religion, condemning heretics, in some cases to the punishment of death, altering the *lex crimen majestatis* to an Inquisition, forbidding sacrifices, and confirming to ecclesiastics many judicial and municipal functions formerly exercised by secular magistrates.

Modern familiarity with the provisions of this code has been derived

⁶ Hallam, 676. On the forgeries and corruptions in the Theodosian Code consult Gibbon, II, 307*n*.

chiefly from the *Lex Romana*, or *Breviarium Alaricianum*,⁷ compiled by Count Goiaric, comes palatini, in the reign and by the order of Alaric II., at Aire (south-western France) in the year 504 and promulgated at Toulouse in 506. The collection of Alaric contains the Theodosian code (sixteen books); the laws of the emperors Theodosius, Valentinian, Marcian, Majorian, and Severus; the Institutes of Gaius; the *Receptæ Sententiæ* of Paulus; the Gregorian code (thirteen titles); the Hermoginian code (two titles); and a passage from Papian's work, erroneously called the *Liber Responsorum*. These laws and juridical materials are followed by the Interpretations, which consist of alterations, adaptations and explanations, inserted by the ecclesiastical and civil jurisconsults of Gaul, who were employed by Alaric. This code clothes the Church with many prerogatives and powers formerly vested in the civil magistrates, as wills, wardships, the emancipation of slaves, and control over the municipal systems and works.⁸ The *Lex Romana*, sometimes alluded to as the law of the Visigoths, was used throughout Gothic France, Spain, and Lombardy; in the former countries until the Saracenic invasion, and in the latter, until the fall of Desiderius and the transfer of his dominions to the Papacy.

In 528, during the first year of the reign of Justinian, he issued, from his court at Constantinople, a decree which provided for the revision and recodification of the Gregorian, Hermoginian, and Theodosian codes. The work was entrusted to a commission of nine advocates, all of the new faith. At the head of this body was Tribonian.⁹ This work was completed and promulgated at Constantinople in 529, and is now known as the *Codex Vetus*. It is no longer extant, having been superceded, six years later, by a Revised code, (*Codex Repetilæ Prælectionis*,) which embraced the constitutions of Justinian and the overflow of, (or the disputed principles which the compilers hesitated to incorporate in,) the Digest, next to be mentioned. In 530 a further commission, this time composed of seventeen lawyers, headed by Tribonian, were entrusted with the more arduous task of digesting the whole body of the law and of reducing it to moderate proportions. This measure opened the door to the only gleams of freedom which enlighten the gloomy compendium. The task was commenced forth-

⁷ Guizot says the former was the original name, and that the latter was not employed until the sixteenth century. *Hist. Civ.*, II, 8.

⁸ Guizot, II, 8-II.

⁹ Philosopher, poet, astronomer, essayist, lawyer, politician, financier, courtier, and sycophant. It was Tribonian who, in fulsome admiration of his imperial patron, feared that Justinian, like Romulus, (why not also like Julius Cæsar and Augustus, Oh wily Tribonian?) would be snatched away into the air and translated alive to Heaven! *Procop.*, *Anecd.*, c. 13, and *Suidas*, III, 501.

with; the work is said to have been completed and promulgated at Constantinople in 533.

The materials at hand were, first, the Twelve Tables, the acts of the Commons and senate, the decrees and decisions of the consuls, prætors, tribunes, censors, and other magistrates, and the writings of the old republicans, such as Cato, the Scævolas, Sulpicius, Marcus Junius Brutus, (father of the regicide,) Varrus, Cicero, Marcus Manilius, Labeo, and others. No use whatever was made of these materials; they were tinctured with liberty, and were swept out of sight at once, never again to be recovered, except in the fragmentary allusions of historians.¹⁰ The Pandects, as they remain to-day, though they embody the wisdom and sometimes the political spirit of these ancient authorities, have refused to transmit the language of these authorities to posterity. The Pandects embrace such of the principles and commentaries of the later (imperial,) jurisconsults, as the compilers agreed between themselves, or separately ventured, to introduce into the work. Some of these are given entire, others are mutilated or assigned to a false author or period, sometimes to borrow authority for a corrupt opinion, sometimes with apparently no worse motive than to secure their preservation. These literary infidelities, or forgeries, appear upon comparing the Pandects with the Code and with the treatises recovered in recent years from palimpsests.

Substantially the work is a Digest of Roman law during the empire, from Hadrian to Alexander Severus, and that only in a restricted sense, for most of the laws relating to the Julian or Augustan and to the more ancient religions, are carefully suppressed. Notwithstanding this limited scope, many principles and allusions were unwittingly allowed to remain, whose roots reached back to a purer age than that of Julianism. This, indeed, is what afterwards brought it under the ban of the Church. The Digest was prepared in the interests of the New Religion and by members of the new communion, and it was intended to supercede the laws and principles which had grown up with imperial paganism, so that the latter might be utterly destroyed and forgotten. But the establishment of a new religion, if coupled with the destruction of an old one, are not such easy matters as we have been taught to believe. Temples may be overthrown, sepulchres violated, testaments burned, epistles forged, ceremonies misappropriated, or symbols perverted, but behind all these are the laws of persons and property, the customs of the people, the idioms of lan-

¹⁰ They had previously been "cleared away by the axe of imperial mandates and constitutions," says the gloomy Tertullian. *Apol.*, IV, 50. Gibbon, IV, 361.

guage, the nummular system, and other monuments of the past, which neither religious hatred can alter, nor religious zeal destroy. The works of Justinian reveal many of these monuments. They unwittingly conserve much of that ancient spirit which they were expressly designed to efface.¹¹ They disclose the age when the Levitical law was first studied at Rome,¹² and they prove that slavery, polygamy, the exposure of children, and many other forms of wickedness and crime, which modern christianity has condemned and eradicated, were legalized and permitted at a time, when, if the accepted story of its origin were true, the Christian religion had but recently issued fresh and full of vigor from the portals of Divine Authority. Between 534 and 565 the Pandects were frequently altered by new edicts, *novellæ*, which have since been admitted into the body of that compilation. Some of these disclose the venality of the emperor, while others mark the avidity of the church.¹³

The Institutes are modelled on those of Caius, or Gaius, an eminent jurisconsult under the Antonines, nearly the whole of whose priceless work has been within recent years recovered from a palimpsest of the monk Lactantius. The plan of the Institutes embraces the general principles of law concerning Persons, Things, Actions, Private Wrongs, Public Wrongs, and Crimes; and it was inevitable that within this generous scope much was included that failed to harmonize with either the politics, the church, the interests, or the moral code, which Justinian practiced or professed, and between which he continually vacillated.¹⁴ The Institutes are said to have been promulgated at Constantinople the same year as the Pandects, so that the three great legal

¹¹ "The laudable desire of conciliating ancient names with recent institutions destroyed the harmony and swelled the magnitude of the obscure and irregular system." Gibbon, IV, 415.

¹² The Levitical laws were certainly known in Rome during the reign of Hadrian, for Juvenal, writing at that period, describes some of them with minuteness: "*Quidam sortite metuentem Sabbata patrem, nil præter nubes, et cœli numen adorant, nec distare putant humana carne suillam, quâ pater abstinuit, mox et præputia ponunt, Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges, Judaicum ediscunt, et servant ac metuunt jus, tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses: non monstrare vias, eadem nisi sacra colenti, quæsitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos. Sed pater in causa cui septima quæque fuit lux ignava, et partem vitæ non attigit ullum.*" Sat. XIV, 96. But there is no evidence of the adoption of any of them until the reigns of Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian, when their heavier punishments were employed to check adultery, sodomy, and other crimes of kindred nature.

¹³ Forged bequests to the church, dated thirty or forty years back, were legalized by a retrospective edict, *novella*, which extended the claims of the church to the term of a century. After serving its fraudulent purpose, this law was repealed. Procopius, *Anecdot.*, c. 28.

¹⁴ Gibbon, IV, 380, *n.*

monuments ascribed to this reign all saw the light within the six years, 528-33.

Like Julius who employed Sosigenes, and Augustus who retained Manilius, to regulate the calendar, so Justinian is said to have secured the services of Dionysius Exiguus, to abolish the Julian æra, to calculate and promulgate the æra of Christ, and to utilize the ceremonies and fit the calendar of the new religion to the festivals already consecrated by immemorial custom. If this account can be relied upon the labours of this ingenious monk mark the fact that both of Justinian's reforms, those of the Law and of the Calendar, were undertaken at the same time, and with apparently the same motive, to blot out and efface all knowledge and memory of the sinful religion with which Rome daily insulted the majesty of the Creator and to substitute in its place the purer worship of Christ. The reforms proposed by Dionysius are ascribed to the year 525, but even if invented at that period, which is by no means certain, they probably had no practical efficacy in Constantinople nor in Rome until a much later period.

All the legal collaborations of Justinian, known collectively as the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, were prepared originally in Latin and afterwards translated into Greek. If the narrative handed down to us is true they were promulgated in Rome when the arms of Belisarius restored Italy to the empire.¹⁵ It is alleged that before this time many of the so-called barbarian (but really provincial or Romance) systems of law were constructed, and evidently to some extent upon the basis of the Twelve Tables and the Theodosian code. The *Lex Romana* ascribed to Alaric II. has been already mentioned, but it is claimed that previous to this, about A. D. 500, Theodoric, his predecessor on the Ostrogothic throne, had promulgated a code of laws based on that of Theodosius. It is also said that about the same date Clovis romanized the laws of the Salic Franks and that about 517 Sigismund, feudal king of Burgundy, promulgated a code of laws drawn from similar sources. The code of the Riparian Franks and of the Bavarians ascribed to Dagobert and the Anglo-Saxon code attributed to Ethelbert, were probably compiled originally during or else after the seventh century. They all bespeak the study of the Theodosian code, and, like that compendium, they mark, if genuine, the date on or near which the new religion was first introduced into the several countries to which they relate. Nor was what may be termed the

¹⁵ According to the mutilated text of Procopius and the calculations of Father Pagi, this was in 536, but the date is only to be received provisionally. It does not say much for the enterprise of our college presses, that the Civil Law has never been published in the vernacular.

Theodosian phase of religion without its legal celebrities, for example, Auvergnat Andarchius, in the sixth, and St. Bonet; and Bishop Didies of Cahors, in the seventh century.

The story of the loss and providential discovery of the Pandects at Amalfi in 1135 is a fable.¹⁶ They were never lost and never found. When the legislation of Justinian was substituted for that of Theodosius, copies of the Pandects were, in like manner, sent to all the provinces. The evidence of this fact will be found in the altered structure of the so-called barbarian codes. The Arabian Mahomet, the Frankish Charlemagne, the Anglo-Saxon Alfred, and the Spanish Alfonso, were all familiar either with the Pandects or else the Civil Law from which it was drawn; and, both at Damascus, Aix-la-Chapelle, York and Leon, schools existed where its study was pursued. The forms of the Parisian monk Marculfus, seventh century, the studies of Hincmar, ninth century, and the laws of Sancho IV., of Aragon,¹⁷ all denote familiarity with the Civil Law. In 1117 the Pandects were expounded at Chartres by a Christian bishop, whose Gothic name of Ivan, betrays the reason of his fidelity to a Ghibelline emperor. The Pandects were taught at Constantinople early in the twelfth century; at Bologna before 1118 by Irnerius; at Canterbury in 1138 by Theobald of Normandy; at Oxford in 1147 by Vicarius of Bologna; and at Montpellier during the same century by Placentius. It was only after ecclesiastical Rome had succeeded in placing her foot upon the neck of the German emperor, that her priests could not find the Pandects; and the reason of this was that its pages, though they had been prepared under the sanction of a so-called Christian emperor, did not sustain her ambitious and growing pretensions. Then it was that the study of the Civil Law was suppressed by intolerance and supplanted by new forgeries and impostures.¹⁸

The medieval church of Rome cursed the law, reviled it, and spat upon it; she excommunicated those who presumed to study it, and would have destroyed it, as she had destroyed thousands of other monuments and records of antiquity.¹⁹ Wherever and whenever the

¹⁶ This fable, accepted by Blackstone, Robertson, Henry, and numerous other authors, disappeared from history after it had the misfortune to fall under the merciless scrutiny of Gibbon.

¹⁷ Calcott's Spain, I, 287.

¹⁸ The study of the Civil Law in the universities of Paris and Oxford was prohibited by the Popes. Hallam's Middle Ages, 677.

¹⁹ The same Gregory who is said to have introduced christianity into Britain had burned the library of the Palatine which had been founded by Augustus; had forbidden the study of the Roman authors, particularly of Livy; had destroyed manuscripts, mutilated inscriptions and statues; had defaced temples and endeavoured to destroy all the evidences of Roman civilization and religion. Draper, chap. XII.

imperial authority prevailed, will the Civil Law be found, and wherever and whenever the papal authority prevailed, the Civil Law was either lost, or rendered difficult of access. But all in vain. "No power was ever based on foundations so sure and deep as those which Rome laid. * * * It was imperishable because it was universal. * * * When her military power departed, her sway over the world of thought began * * * and her language, her theology, her laws, her architecture, made their way where the eagles of war had never flown." ²⁰

The Roman law of Britain was derived originally from those purer streams which were afterwards filled up with the coarse materials of Justinian's edifice. We may believe that the law school of York, in the fourth century, drew its inspiration from the jurisconsults of the Commonwealth and the early empire, and from the works of Labeo rather than those of Capito. In the earlier courts of the heptarchy both the study and the practice of the Roman law was suspended; with the introduction of the new religion it was revived; except that for the works of the old masters were substituted those of Theodosius and Justinian. When in the ninth century the ecclesiastical establishment of Rome attempted to throw off all allegiance to the empire, whether Eastern or Western, it began to create its own system of jurisprudence, the basis of which was the Roman law,²¹ the forged charter of St. Peter, the municipal powers granted by the emperors, the decrees of its own Councils, and the ordinances of its own bishops.²² The ecclesiastical system beginning with the ninth century is what Hallam called "the canon law, fabricated only for an usurpation that can never be restored."²³ It was frequently recompiled before it was arranged in imitation of the Pandects, a task which was performed by the Italian monk Gratian, in 1140; it must therefore have assumed the form of a complete system at a much earlier date, probably at the close of the Carolingian æra. By the twelfth century the extravagant claims of the papacy, which, as though doubtful of its reward in heaven, claimed everything in sight on earth, drove society to seek refuge in the less exacting code of Justinian, and we

²⁰ Bryce, p. 370.

²¹ That there was an ancient canon Law is evinced by the fact, mentioned in Livy, IX, 46, that until A. U. 449 the Sacred college kept secret the Code of Procedure in civil cases, and thus held that control over the administration of the Civil law which it tried to obtain in everything. Under the hierarchy the canon Law again became the controlling law of Rome.

²² Every Roman bishop, whether pagan or Christian, was a pope, a title that was not limited to the chief bishop, or pontiff, of Rome, until 1037, by decretal of Gregory.

²³ Hallam's Middle Ages, 678.

find that this was studied at Aragon and Chartres before it was "discovered" at Amalfi.

These circumstances, coupled with others alluded to elsewhere in this work, enable us to arrive at more or less certain inferences with regard to the influence of the Roman law in Britain. They leave us to infer that the law of all Britain down to the fourth century was substantially the law of the Roman Commonwealth, that is to say of Rome before feudalism had settled into a matured system; ²⁴ that this also continued to be the law of those isolated cities of Britain which preserved their Roman government after the Gothic risings; that although attempts were made by Alfred, Edgar, and Edward Confessor, to amalgamate the Mercian, Danish and West Saxon codes into one common law, all these attempts failed; and that in Britain generally—if such an expression is admissible where there was no sole monarchy, and, certainly so far as Wessex is concerned, no entirely independent one—in Britain generally, the Gothic codes, largely modified by feudal and local customs and increasingly modified by such provisions of the Theodosian and Justinian codes as the pontificate permitted to be introduced, was the law of the land; that between the ninth and twelfth century the Roman law, which at this period largely assumed the appearance of a purely ecclesiastical code, entirely usurped the place of the early Romance codes; and that in the thirteenth century the more secular phases of the Roman law again came in to displace the canon law and constitute that common law of England, which, to-day, freed more and more from its feudal and canonical corruptions, forms one of the glories of the British constitution. ²⁵

²⁴ In the author's "Middle Ages Revisited" evidences are adduced from Josephus concerning the existence of feudalism in the earliest days of the Empire.

²⁵ "Although the vestiges of the Coliseum and of the Vatican shall crumble away from the face of the earth, the institutions, the laws, and the fortunes of Rome, will not have ceased to be inseparably interwoven with the destinies of mankind." Sir F. Palgrave, p. 317. "The ruins of ancient Rome supplied the materials of a new city; and the fragments of her law, which have already been wrought into the recent codes of France and Prussia, will probably, under other names, guide far distant generations by the sagacity of Modestinus and Ulpian." Hallam, 678.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ROMAN HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Developement of political liberty—Caste—Councils—Legislatures—The Commons of the Curiata was based upon rank—The Centuriata upon wealth—The Tributa upon respectability—These legislatures were successively destroyed by ecclesiasticism, and all knowledge of them was lost until after the Fall of the Sacred empire in 1204—That event was immediately followed by the resuscitation of the Commons—The English House of Commons is the direct offspring of the Roman Comitia and has nothing whatever to do with the barbarian Witenagemote.

THE same false lights which have led the modern historian to search for the germs of feudalism in the simple structures of barbarian communities, have misled him with respect to the origin of the House of Commons. This has been traced to the witenagemotes of the Northern chieftains. We shall endeavour to show that such an opinion is without foundation.

The essential principle of a House of Commons is happily expressed in its name. It is a peaceful assemblage of the common people, a term that implies a limited or representative body, that is to say, as many of the common people as can be conveniently assembled in a house, or some other enclosure. There is still another implication which may fairly be deduced from the term House of Commons, namely, the co-existence and coördination of another house, not a House of Commons. This could only be a house of nobles, or priests; in other words, a senate. As a matter of fact, there is no instance in history of a House of Commons without a senate. And the reason of this is evident. Political liberty is not born with communal life, but is the fruit of its evolution. The day that men commenced to live together, gave birth, not to freedom, but to slavery. It was only after they had lived together some thousands of years that they became so much alike, in fortune, endowments, capacity and opportunities, as to render political liberty possible. One of the necessary steps from despotism and slavery, to equality and freedom, is a legislature; and if these views be admitted, it follows that, in the early stages of its development, the legislature, originating in a council, must be an as-

semblage of nobles, or of men belonging to some superior order. Consequently, when in course of time a legislature is formed by the people, it finds itself in the presence of a pre-existing legislature, which was formed by the nobles.¹

The legislatures of all the earlier states of antiquity were assemblages of priests and nobles, never of the common people, until such assemblages were formed in Greece and Rome. Leaving Greece out of view, because it was absorbed into the Roman republic, of which it became part, it is not too much to say that, until comparatively recent times, if one ventured beyond the confines of Roman civilization, he would have had to explain who the commons were, and what it was which enabled them to assemble and legislate. Even at the present day, with the anomalous and quite recent exception of Japan, there is no state, not erected upon the remains of Roman institutes, which possesses a House of Commons, or a popular assemblage with legislative power. In Russia, the foremost of them all, after some two thousand years of communal existence, a thousand of which have been enriched by the teachings of the gospels, there is only a Senate, which is an assemblage of nobles and prelates. There is no House of Commons; no general convocation of the people to make laws for the empire; no self government. The sun of liberty has never dawned for the moujik. His political world is surrounded by a firmament of impenetrable darkness, illumined only by the lurid firebrands of nihilism, and the deceptive smirk of his gilded icons.

Nor is a Senate the first step of those institutes which ascend from despotism to liberty; there are many previous ones. Among these is the Council, the essential difference between which and a Senate being that the latter has legislative power, whilst the Council has not.

¹ In the northern Arcadia, depicted by Tacitus, the whole people, nobles as well as commons, all of them armed to the teeth and provided with seats, came together at intervals to enact measures offered by the king and approved by the priests. (*Germania*, xi-xii.) From this fanciful text the exuberant Brottier derives the Merovingian *champs de Mars*, the Carolingian *champs de Mai*, and finally the states-general. Mallet, 128, found the remains of several of these German houses of commons, which proved to be neither German, nor houses, nor common. One was near Lunden, in Scania, (southern Sweden,) a second at Leyra, or Lethra, in Zealand, and a third near Viburg, in Jutland. They each consisted of thirteen stone seats, twelve in a circle, the thirteenth in the middle; the former for the council, the latter for the king. This assemblage (as we read) was guarded by soldiers, who performed the part of a claque to the drama going on within. Beyond the soldiers stood the unarmed populace. The numbers of this council proclaim its Buddhic foundation. It had remotely the same origin as the *campus martius*, the *comitia*, the twelve jurymen of the Roman Commonwealth, the *champs de Mars*, and the states-general; but it was immediately neither the origin nor the offspring of these institutes.

Many of the roving tribes whom the Europeans found in America had pow-wows, or councils. These assemblages consisted of sachems and wizards (medicine-men) whose collective function it was to counsel or advise the Chief. The peculiar phases which such a body might assume, in the long process of evolution from a tribal council to a legislature, and the local form and colour, which it might derive from the peculiar civilization with whose affairs it was concerned, might conceal the process of metamorphosis; but it could not destroy the essential difference between two such bodies, when viewed historically. It is not known that any of the American tribal councils ever acquired power to make laws which commanded the obedience of their tribes. Neither is it believed that any of the European tribal witenagemotes became legislatures. They were simply what their name expressed. Gemote is an assemblage; wita is a wit, or wizard. A witenagemote was therefore simply, what with reference to the Indians was called, a pow-wow, a council of medicine-men and sachems, to advise the Chief; nothing more.²

To claim for such a rudimentary convocation the varied and unlimited powers, the experience, deliberation, self-restraint, decorum, gravity, and dignity, of a Senate, or still more daringly, to claim for it identity with an assemblage of the Commons, in which a whole people, either in person or by representatives, meet to impose laws upon themselves and thus exercise a function out of whose majestic attributes, man, in the archaic ages, fashioned a Brahma, a Buddha, or a Moses—is to ignore the slow genesis of all social institutes, and leave out of view the entire history of Roman civilization. Between the tribal councils of the Saxons and the English House of Commons there is essentially less than a single lifetime, whilst there are no less than fifteen centuries of historical evolution; and the history cannot be crowded into the time. Neither is there any gradual, or natural merger. About the time of Alfred, the councils of the Anglo-Saxon chieftains became councils of petty kings, and in the reign of William they became the single council of a “sole monarch;”³ but while these changes bespeak an evolution of the kingly power, they indicate no alteration in the nature of the council. It was still fundamentally what it had been in the earliest days of the witenagemote, an assemblage of wizards and warriors, or of prelates and nobles, to advise

² Pow-wow is an English, not an Indian term. It was originally applied, in derision, to the jargon and strange rites of the medicine-men, and afterwards, by metonym, to the assemblages in which they took part. In point of fact, the Indian councils were not noisy.

³ Lord Coke, in referring to the “parliament” of Edward Confessor, 1041, meant by that name, a council, not a legislature.

the chieftain, now the king. It had no legislative power, not even over the classes from which it was recruited.⁴ The great mass of the people had no concern with it, indeed under the Norman dynasty there was no people. Roman ecclesiasticism had long since destroyed their political existence. There were no representatives of the people. There was a subjugated nation, not the victims of a military conquest, but the nameless⁵ slaves of an insidious hierarchy. This nation was deeply imbued with the germs of religious and political liberty; but until after the Fall of Constantinople these germs rarely saw the light, and the English peasant of that period had little more practical acquaintance with political liberty, than the Russian moujik of to-day. In the numerous allusions to the Royal Council which occur in the pages of Matthew Paris, whose annals bring us down to the year 1259, it is always called the King's Council or the Curia Regis, or the King's Parliament, and is invariably described as an advisory board, never as a legislature.⁶

The secular spirit of the Gothic race, though subdued by Roman witchery, was not destroyed. In every Saxon and Norman breast there lurked an undying hatred to hierarchy. In the earlier Roman literature, many vestiges of which reached the hands of the Norman nobles of this period, every page breathed the spirit of the old republican liberty. When the muddy waters of the Sacred empire subsided, the ancient Ark of Liberty drifted into view and sent forth its Dove and its olive branches of "peace on earth and good-will to men." These tokens of amity and political liberty were found, not in the miraculous *Aurea Legenda*, but in the pages of the Roman historians and the

⁴ It was the same in the other Roman provinces. Alcubilla claims a cortes for Leon, with "the popular element," in 1021. *Diccionario de la Administracion Española*, por D. Marcelo Martinez Alcubilla, Madrid, 1886, art. "Cortes." But this was a mere council of nobles and prelates to advise the king. It is mentioned by Hallam, (250,) who says that in its presence "Alfonso V. established the privileges of that city." If the king did his will, it was no cortes in the modern sense, but only a council; a fact clearly admitted by Hallam, 259. The "deputies of cities" are mentioned in the cortes of 1188, (first year of Alfonso IX. of Leon,) but the burghers had nothing to do with their appointment, and they had no legislative power, when they met. (Hallam, 260.) The first legislative cortes was that of Aragon, during the reign of Peter III., 1276-85, and consisted of four classes, prelates, lords, knights, and commons. The first states-general, in France, was in 1302.

⁵ The commons, or people of the third estate, had no family names until after the period of Magna Charta, nor were such names common until the Reign of Edward III. Indeed, the rise, continuance, and fall, of the Roman Comitia and the modern Commons, and the use, disuse, and resumption, of family names of the people, were synchronal. M. A. Lowers, "Dictionary of English Surnames."

⁶ See, for composition of "Parliament" in the year 1246, Matthew Paris, II, 148.

principles of the Roman law. The union of the Gothic spirit of freedom and the literature of the Roman republic, bred a constant demand for some engine of legislation other than the Sacred college of Rome. To this demand England's priest-ridden king was forced to yield. No sooner had Constantinople fallen than John issued a writ, or writing, dated in 1205, summoning the prelates and barons of the kingdom to a convocation. This is the first writ of the kind on official record in England; the first one, the text of which is actually extant, bears the date 1265.⁷ So cautiously did the convocation first summoned by John assume legislative powers, that afterwards it actually agreed to submit a Compact (the Provisions of Oxford) which it made with his successor, Henry III., to the approval of the king of France, who in fact annulled it, at Amiens, January 23rd, 1264. It was not until 1295 that the representatives of the burghs, the burgesses, were invited to form a portion, a second chamber, of the Parliament; nor until 1327, when it deposed Edward II., that it assumed the right, in cases of emergency, to act independently of the crown. Parry dates the commencement of legislative functions after the beginning of Edward's reign; the dethronement of the king proves that these functions became completely matured in the rapid course of twenty years. In other words, from the time when the king's parliament was a single body and a mere council, to the time when it became a dual body and a complete legislature, was an interval of less than a quarter of a century.

Now, what is it that could have so suddenly converted the witenagemote, or the king's advisory council, into two legislative bodies, one representing the churchmen and nobles, the other the boroughs and citizens, and both together exercising the right to make laws for the kingdom, and even to depose the king himself? Nothing whatever; for no such miracle took place. The two things are totally dissimilar, and belong to phases of civilization very, very, far apart. They do not fit, they do not match, they do not merge, there is, so to speak, no continuous lode, or vein. The Saxon witenagemote and the English legislature are separated, not merely by a single regnal period, nor even by that immense interval of time which elapsed between the Roman Commonwealth and the accession of Edward III., but also by dissonance of origin, history, and function. The composition and powers of the two bodies were fundamentally different. The witenagemote was merely an advisory council of the king, and consisted of such prelates and nobles as he chose or deemed it wise or politic to summon; the Houses of the Lords and Commons was a legislature:

⁷ Parry, "Parliaments and Councils of England."

the latter consisted of such members of the commonalty as were appointed or elected according to law, and it had the right to assemble and exercise its functions. The interval of time which elapsed between the *Comitia* of Rome and the Commons of England might possibly have been sufficient, under favourable circumstances, to develop a barbarian *pow-wow*, or council, into a senate, or a House of Lords; but twice that interval of time would not have sufficed to mature it into a popular legislature or House of Commons. The latter, therefore, could not have sprung from the *witenagemote*.

As for that opinion of the Sorbonne which was voiced by the learned Guizot, that modern legislatures derive their origin from the so-called Christian ecclesiastical councils of the dark ages, it is hardly worth the trouble of refuting.⁸ There is even less connection between such bodies as these are described to have been, than between a popular legislature and a barbarian *witenagemote*. The Brahminical, the Egyptian, and the Levitical codes, all of them some thousands of years ago, gave birth to ecclesiastical councils; but neither of them, nor any other hierarchical system, ever bred a legislature; and it is tolerably safe to predict that they never will breed one. The supposed development of the Saxon *witenagemote* into a legislative chamber chosen by the people, has been the theme of historians who were anxious to prove the superiority of all Anglo-Saxon institutions. Let us endeavour to follow the English House of Commons from an earlier and more natural, if less flattering, source.

Omitting from view the legislative assemblies previously established in Greece, as opening too wide a field of research, and confining the view entirely to Rome, it soon becomes evident that in the matured institutions of that great state, and not in the customs of shifting and predatory tribes, are to be found the origin of the English House of Commons and other modern legislatures. In early Rome the citizens—and these, it must be remembered, were a select and limited, or representative, class—were enrolled in several different organizations; at first into tribes and parishes, afterward into census classes. During several centuries these organizations existed contemporaneously; but in serving, as each of them did, at one time or another, for a legislative assembly, they successively exerted all, or nearly all, the constitutional powers of the Commons. Thus, during the reign or pre-

⁸ Guizot concealed a fact which the epigraphic monuments establish beyond question, namely, that the concilia of the Dark Ages were not Christian assemblages, but idolatrous organizations, to practice and enforce the worship of Augustus Cæsar, as the pretended son of God. Rushforth.

valence of the comitia Centuriata, the Curiata was a decayed assembly, which only retained some ceremonial and trifling remains of its ancient power; whilst the Tributa, not yet conscious of its eventful future, was little more than a popular club, with power to elect certain minor public officials. (Dio. Hal., iv, 20.) Each of these successive comitias or Houses of Commons was linked to a senate, whose composition and powers, from time to time, will now be briefly mentioned. The senate which Romulus is said to have created consisted of one hundred patricians, of whom the thirty curiæ or parishes of Rome, chose three each. The three tribes, into which all the citizens, (parishioners or not,) were divided, also chose three each, and the king the remaining one. The senators were afterward chosen by the censors, but only from among those patricians who had served a necessary apprenticeship in the military and civil services. Some authors hold that Romulus, others that Tarquinius, increased the senate to the sacred 300 which composed its numbers down to the time of Sylla. The senate of the archaic period were the guardians of religion, of the sibylline books, of the treasury, the army, and the navy; of subsidiary kings, and of allied cities; they appointed all ambassadors out of their own body, they appointed the public magistrates, judges and priests, they treated with foreign nations, they conferred military honours and triumphs, they could bestow the title of king, they declared war or peace, they formed a court for the trial of treason, and other high crimes; and they could proclaim and enforce martial law in times of peace.

When the middle class had greatly increased in numbers and influence there was added to the senate that second chamber or assembly already mentioned, called the comitia Curiata, upon which some of the powers of the senate were conferred. This chamber is commonly described as an assembly of all the plebians, but the correctness of such a view is not quite free from doubt.⁹ Rather does it seem to have been a representative body, consisting of delegates from the thirty religious congregations, or parishes, into which Rome and the three tribes were divided. These delegates were chiefly, if not all, of the middle class. They voted in the Curiata by parishes, each one of which had its own temple and its own religious congregation, each curia having one vote. The vote of sixteen curiæ, no matter how few or many suffragans it represented, was sufficient to carry or defeat any measure, or to elect the king, or any other magistrate; for such was one of the powers conferred upon this comitia by the new constitution. The Curiata could not be held without authority of the senate, nor could either

⁹ Consult Livy, vi, 18; xxix, 19; Aul. Gell., xv, 27; Ramshorn, 307.

chamber lawfully meet on the same day as the other. The king was elected by both chambers; the inferior magistrates by the Curiata alone. With the parish priest behind each vote of the Curiata, and in front of it those allurements of military and ecclesiastical preferment which the senate could offer to its members, it is easy to infer the ecclesiastical and aristocratic tendency of the Curiata, and the dissatisfaction which its composition and proceedings occasioned to the citizens of a state, whose institutes owed so much to Greek republican influence, as did those of Rome. Clouds of ecclesiastical legends have obscured the details of this subject, but the outline is perceptible in the assassination, real or pretended, of Romulus, the regulation of the priesthood by Numa, and the repression of the patricians by the emancipated slave Servius Tullius.

The constitution established by this king destroyed the power of the Curiata by degrading them from the position of a legislature, to that of a mere electoral convocation. The Curiata continued to meet at intervals, but their function was impaired; and whereas they formerly needed the Campus Martius, they now found plenty of room in the Forum. They could still elect the flamines, or change the sacra of a citizen, or legitimize an act of adoption, and perhaps conduct trials for high treason; but little more. The citizens soon ceased to attend their convocations, and, after the establishment of the Commonwealth, the Curiata gradually sank into oblivion.¹⁰ Beyond depriving the censors of their power to choose the senators, a power which the king took into his own hands, the constitution of Servius Tullius made but little change in the powers of the senate. With this body was now coördinated a chamber, chosen in an entirely different manner from the Curiata. The latter had been based upon rank; the Centuriata was based upon wealth. The individual possessions of the the citizens having been ascertained by means of a census, they were divided into six classes. Commencing with the richest, the first class was subdivided into forty centuries of foot soldiers, eighteen of cavalry, and forty of city guards; each century having a vote in the comitia Centuriata. In like manner the second class had twenty-two centuries, the third twenty, the fourth twenty-two, the fifth thirty, and the sixth, one; in all, 193 centuries. The first rank represented the fewest number of citizens, yet had 98, or a majority of all the votes; the sixth rank represented more citizens than all the others combined, yet it had but one vote. The Centuriata was therefore a

¹⁰ Toward the close of the Republic thirty lictors were the only representatives of the thirty parishes which were represented in the comitia. Cicero, *de Lege, Agr.*, II, 12.

limited assembly, representing property, one in which the sixth rank, or poorer class, of citizens, was practically without a voice. The assembly was therefore of aristocratic tendency, yet far less subject, than the Curiata had been, to ecclesiastical control.

As the majority of all the votes prevailed, the first rank, called the prerogative century, practically had the comitia to itself. This was perhaps not the original constitution of the Centuriata, but that into which it settled. The representatives, those who counted the votes in this comitia, were nominated at party "caucuses," or primary, or preliminary, elections, and elected by a majority of the century to which they respectively belonged. The Centuriata met at first at the Campus Martius, probably in the Villa Publica,¹¹ afterwards at the Janiculum. The sessions were opened with prayers and sacred rites.¹² The speaker, centurio maximo, was then elected. This officer had great influence, and among other powers, could grant or withhold the privilege of a member to the floor.¹³ The speaker having made his opening address, the House was ready for business. Votes were taken at first by word of mouth, sometimes by divisions, when the votes were counted by the representatives or custodes, afterwards by ballots deposited in urns. During the session a standard or flag was hoisted over the Janiculum, and when the comitia adjourned, the flag was hauled down.

The resemblance of these functions and ceremonies to those which distinguish the lower house of the modern British legislature, is so remarkable that no further excuse is deemed necessary for calling the Roman comitia, what indeed its name indicates it to have been, a House of Commons. It is true, that unlike the modern legislature, the Roman comitia did not consist of members or representatives elected for a term, and only amenable to change or displacement by formal impeachment, or when that term was over. In the comitia the people could displace their representatives or custodes, at any time. But these peculiar modes of expressing the popular will do not mar the essential resemblance between the two bodies. They were both legislatures, they were legislatures which were designed to express the popular will, and which, more or less perfectly, did express it; and this is what neither witenagemote nor church-council ever did, or ever attempted to do. The manner of voting, the limitations placed upon votes, the duration of the citizen's or the delegate's office, the powers of the presiding officer, all these are details of minor importance.

The comitia Centuriata elected the consuls, censors, prætors, and other principal magistrates, including the rex sacrarum, and the dec-

¹¹ Livy, IV, 22.

¹² Livy, XXXIX, 15.

¹³ Livy, I, 60; II, 2; III, 54; IX, 7.

enviri. It supplanted the Curiata in sitting as a high court of justice in cases of impeachment for treason, and, as we shall presently see, furnished the basis of the jury system, by opening its doors to any citizen who desired to appeal from the decision of a magistrate to the judgement of his peers. In other respects the powers of the comitia were connected with those of the senate. It could only enact laws in conjunction with that body. All bills which originated in the comitia were committed to writing, and read over aloud, before they were put to vote. When passed, they were engrossed and sent to the senate.¹⁴ The comitia could be summoned to meet on any lawful day by edict of the consuls, or, in their absence, by edict of the prætor. This edict had to be issued at least twenty-seven days, three weeks, *tres nundinæ*, in advance of the proposed meeting, an interval which gave time for popular heat to cool down. The house was rarely convened on the *nundine* or day of rest, because this was to be kept holy, no business being allowed.¹⁵ But exceptions were sometimes made.¹⁶ Sessions at which the public magistrates were elected, were usually held about six months before their official terms were to commence. The censors were exceptions; their terms commenced immediately after their election. All who had the full right of Roman citizens, whether they lived at Rome or elsewhere, enjoyed the privilege to visit the comitia, but only those within certain ages and otherwise qualified, could vote. They were essentially representatives. Candidates for offices in the comitia, such as those of *custodes*, used the same arts to gain votes as are employed now; they canvassed the people by visiting their houses, accosting them in a friendly and respectful manner in public, or by addressing them on *nundines*, or other idle days, from the top of some rising ground, or the stump of a tree, or other elevated place.¹⁷ There were also clubs or sodalities, of voters, mock-clubs or "strikers," and, toward the end of the republic, election-agents, middle-men and secret dealers in votes.¹⁸

In the exquisite work of art called the *Venus de Milo* one cheek is higher than the other, the chin is "lopsided," the brow is low, etc. These imperfections have been justly regarded by art-critics as evidences that the statue was designed from a real, a living, subject. In like manner, the very imperfections of the Roman comitia prove that it was a real, an actual, a human, institution. On the other hand, the

¹⁴ Livy, I, 60; III, 34; V, 52; VI, 20; X, 22; XXXI, 6, 7.

¹⁵ Table III. of the Twelve Tables; Macrob., I, 16.

¹⁶ Cicero, Att., I, 14.

¹⁷ Cicero, Att., I, 1; Piso, 23; Horace, Ep. I, 50, 60, etc.; Macrob., I, 16.

¹⁸ Cicero, Plan. 15, 16; Adam, 170; Pliny, Let. VII, 9.

entire absence of any such blemishes in the Saxon witenagemote, when regarded as a legislature, is sufficient, by itself, to stamp it as a mere phantasm, a phantasm which has been conjured up by the ecclesiastical mind, to support its ghostly history of the dark and mediæval ages. Not only do the modern and the Roman legislatures resemble each other in being imperfect, they still more resemble each other in the identity of such blemishes. These blemishes, as has been shown, were alike in both cases. Thus, not only the structure, as before shown, but the very features, of these bodies, betray their kinship and the descent of one from the other. When similar features can be discovered in the witenagemote, it will be time enough to enquire why it slumbered as a council from the reign of Ina in the seventh century, to that of Edward II., in the fourteenth, and then woke up all of a sudden as a legislature.

Although the *comitia Centuriata* was evidently intended to be a secular chamber, the unwearied assiduity of the priesthood succeeded in bringing it, like its predecessor the *Curiata*, under ecclesiastical subjection. This process began with the innocent custom of opening the sessions with prayers and religious rites; then the augurs came into play, and no session could be held nor law passed without their consent; then the *pontifex-maximus* was permitted, when he choosed, to interpose a supplication; until, at last, as it had been anciently in the *Curiata*, the transactions of the House came to depend upon the eagerness or indifference with which the sacred chickens happened to eat their food.¹⁹ As it could not have been a difficult matter for the priests to keep two sets of chickens, exactly alike in size and colour, the one abstinent, the other recently gluttoned, it needs no profundity of intellect to guess how the chicken trick was worked.

After the establishment of the Commonwealth, the plebians made several attempts to stem the rising tide of ecclesiasticism in the *comitia*; but they began too late, and despairing of remedying the evil by lawful means, they adopted the revolutionary expedient of escaping from both ecclesiastical and patrician control—for these were always linked together—by withdrawing, in a body, from the city. This they did, A. U. 261, encamping first on the Aventine and afterwards on Mons Sacer. This procedure led to a Compromise, a new constitution, the creation of Tribunes of the Commons, and the supremacy of the *comitia Tributa* over the *Centuriata*. The first important session of the *Tributa* was summoned by the tribune Sp. Sicinus, to try the impeachment of Coriolanus, A.U. 263.

¹⁹ Lucan, *Pharsal.*, v, 392-6.

The basis of this House of Commons was intended to be neither church-membership, nor wealth; but character and respectability. The various districts of Rome had originally been inhabited by Latins, Sabines, and Luceres, or foreigners, each of whom had their own neighbourhood. Difference of customs and religion was probably the origin of this separation, for it was forbidden to remove out of one ward into another.²⁰ With the growth of the state beyond the municipal limits, this regulation fell into neglect, and Servius Tullius, in order to remedy the disorder which followed, had, in A. U. 188, made a new division of the people, this time into twenty-one tribes or wards, of whom the city contained four, and the suburbs or country, seventeen. It may as well be remarked in this place that, in after times, the number of tribes was increased to thirty-five, and that still later, that is to say, during the decline of the Commonwealth, the censors exercised the invidious power to distribute the citizens into whatever tribes they pleased, without regard to race or domicile. But nothing of this sort was known to the times of which we are now speaking. As the comitia of the twenty-one Tribes proceeded to exercise the powers of a legislature, and, in virtue of the Compromise before mentioned, was recognized as such by the senate, the Centuriata, as a law-making body, fell into disuse, and so did the more objectionable customs that had grown up with it.²¹ Indeed, as we shall presently see, they were expressly prohibited. By the year A. U. 282, the comitia Tributa secured the right to elect the public magistrates. After that time, their sessions became more frequent, and their proceedings more interesting. As to their own officers, the custodes, or tellers, and the speaker, they were elected in the same manner as were those of the Centuriata. In A. U. 299, the people, wearied with the empirical rulings of the magistrates, who, though elected by the comitia, were chiefly of the patrician and ecclesiastical orders, sought and obtained another Compromise with the senate. This was to substitute for the consuls an executive council of ten patricians, Decemviri, who should be obliged to draw up a code of written law and submit the same to the Centuriata for approval; meanwhile the tribunes to be suspended.

In A. U. 305-6, B. C. 449, occurred the tragedy of Virginia, the second secession of the plebeians to the Aventine and Mons Sacer, the fall of the Decemviri, and a new treaty between the patricians and

²⁰ Dionys., IV, 14.

²¹ So late as the time of Cicero the election of the consuls was declared in the Centuriata. "According to the practice and usage of our forefathers, on that day I declared L. Muræna, consul, at the centuriated comitia." *Orat. pro Mur.*, A. U. 691.

commons, which reinstated the consuls and the tribunes of the people, rendered the persons of the latter inviolable, and affirmed the authority of the comitia Tributa over all the functions of state.

It is from this new Constitution that must be dated the real glory of Rome: for it is upon this instrument that is founded the supremacy of the civil law over military and ecclesiastical law, over caste and privilege and the superstitious prerogatives, which still distinguishes the Western world from the Orient. Nor can it be doubted that this great social reform largely promoted and rendered possible the numerical system of Money which was established in Rome some three-fourths of a century afterwards, and which is fully described in the author's "History of Money." One was the necessary complement of the other.

But Rome never entirely freed itself from the aristocratic influences of its earliest form of government. Even in the most democratic times there was a body of exclusives who continually conspired to rule the state. The new Constitution was hardly established before these self-styled patricians sought to limit the powers of the Tributa, by arguing from the etymology of their enactments, (*plebiscita*,) that they only bound the plebs; whereupon the Centuriata, to whom the dispute seems to have been referred, declared that "whatever was ordered by the Comitia collectively, should bind the whole nation." Not only this, but they threw another safeguard around the persons of the popular tribunes, by devoting to Jupiter anybody who should offer them an injury. The property of such offender—and here is to be seen the ancient ecclesiastical hand—was thoughtfully confiscated to the temple of Ceres, Liber, and Libera, the Mother or Spouse, the Son, and the Daughter, of the Buddhic or Bacchic god.²² This last provision implies an understanding between the people and the priests who influenced the Centuriata. It is perhaps needless to say that the defeat of the patricians was not of a lasting character. For a time, indeed, the Tributa became the supreme power of the state. Like the English House of Commons at the present day, it not only co-operated with the senate, it dominated that chamber. It ordered triumphs which had been refused by the senate; it absolved certain persons from the operation of resolutions passed by the senate; it granted to others the freedom of the city; it elected the consuls, the pontifex-maximus, the proconsuls, and the proprætors; it decreed that the comitia might be convened without consent of the senate; it even dared to abolish the auspices and the sacred chickens. These acts of sacrilege had not a little to do with its subsequent downfall.²³ It has been generally held

²² Livy, III, 55.

²³ Livy, II, 56-7, 60; III, 55; V, 52; VIII, 12; IX, 38.

that, in electing the chief-pontiff, only the representatives of seventeen out of the twenty-one tribes voted,²⁴ and in this view the author is disposed to acquiesce; but from the fact that after the expulsion of the decemviri, Quintus Furius, who was pontifex-maximus, A. U. 305-24, summoned the comitia to elect the tribunes of the people, as well as from other considerations, it seems likely that at first the entire comitia elected the chief-pontiff, and that the other custom only grew up at a subsequent date.

In A. U. 441, Appius Claudius, surnamed Cæcus, was censor with C. Plautius.²⁵ The former was a descendant of that decemvir of the same name who occasioned the tragedy of Virginia. He is, however, better known as the builder of the great Aqueduct and the Appian Way, both of which monuments of antiquity still survive. In order to win the favour of the people, Claudius employed his authority of censor to deprive the aristocratic potitii of their fat livings in the temple of Hercules, which he conferred upon plebeians; he admitted certain upstarts, whose free lineage could only be traced backward for a few generations, to the senatorial rank; and he admitted members of the plebian tribes into those of aristocratic tendencies, or membership.²⁶ For these services to the popular cause the comitia permitted him to hold the censorship for five years, and he was twice elected consul, to wit, in A. U. 447 and 448.

However, the next year Quintus Fabius, surnamed Rullianus, became censor, and belonging to the opposite party, he at once proceeded to undo the heinous work of Claudius, by drafting all obnoxious persons into the four urban tribes, thus more or less cleansing the other seventeen, and rendering them less hostile to the patricians and priests. As it was the representatives of seventeen tribes who, after this period, (if not before,) elected the chief-pontiff, and as such chief-pontiff—though the seventeen tribes who elected him were chosen by lot—always proved acceptable to the patrician class, we must believe that the choice of these tribes and their choice of the pontifex-maximus were both directed by miraculous intervention. The reward of Quintus Fabius for his services to the patrician and ecclesiastical party, was the surname of Maximus, a title which his military exploits had entirely failed to procure him.²⁷

In A. U. 416, (Adam says 414 and Lempriere 435,) the dictator Publius Philo “passed three laws highly advantageous to the commons and inimical to the nobility, one that the acts of the commons

²⁴ Cic., Rull., II, 7.

²⁵ Consult the Index to this volume.

²⁶ Livy, IX, 46.

²⁷ Livy, IX, 46; see my “Middle Ages” Index, voc. “Great.”

should bind all Romans, another that the senate should, previous to the taking of the suffrages, declare their approval of all laws which should be passed in the *Centuriata*, and another that one of the censors should be elected out of the commons."²⁸ This is not very explicit. Cicero (*Brut.*, 14) attributes the second law to Mœnius, the tribune, A. U. 467, so that both the purport, the author, and the date of the law, are uncertain. However, it points to the zenith of the power attained by the *comitia*. This supremacy of the popular branch of the legislature was maintained for some two hundred years, before it became obscured by the advancing shadow of the offended but patient chickens. In connection with the superstitious respect which they paid to these fowls, it is curious to note how often and how intimately the Romans mingled religious grovelling with the highest form of legislative wisdom. An example of this kind is found in the *lex Cæcilia Didia*, A. U. 658, which forbade the inclusion of more than one subject in a Bill, and in another law, which required a periodical publication of the public accounts relating to receipts and expenditures. There are some modern states which have not attained, even yet, these perfections of administration.

The final decline of the *comitia* is to be dated from the ill-advised bill of the tribune Apuleius Saturninus, who, in A. U. 654 and under the auspices of Marius, attempted to revive the measure of Mœnius. Saturninus carried a law through the *comitia* which provided that the senators, under penalty of losing their rank, should come to the forum and swear to "confirm whatever the *comitia* should enact." This was, practically, to dispense with the legislative function of the senate altogether, a highly dangerous policy in a state which contained a vast number of superstitious, uneducated, and indigent citizens. However, the senators took the oath—all but the chief-pontiff, Lucius Cæcilius Metellus, surnamed *Dalmaticus*, who quietly but firmly refused. Whereupon the *comitia* decreed that the consuls should interdict Metellus the use of fire and water; and he was banished to Rhodes. Within a year's time Saturninus Glaucius and others of the democratic party were slain; Metellus was recalled; and Rome became involved in a series of civil wars which only ended with the entire downfall of the *comitia* and the practical degradation of the senate to the rank of an imperial council.²⁹

Upon the occasion of electing public magistrates the *comitia Trib-*

²⁸ Livy, VIII, 12.

²⁹ Plutarch, in Marius, I, 464. On August 5, 1893, a similar proposal was discussed in the British House of Commons. An analogous measure, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, is now (1900) being discussed in America.

uta was held in the Campus Martius. For general legislation and impeachments, it met either in the Forum, the Capitol, or the Circus Flaminius. At a later period, a more elegant and distinctive edifice was designed for this legislature; but on account of the Civil Wars the project was abandoned. With the usurpation of Caius (Julius) Cæsar, the comitia substantially ceased to exist. Its formal suppression, however, was the work of Tiberius.

But there is an after-life to legislatures, as there is to the men who compose them: a life that can never die. The comitia of the Republic was commemorated upon its coins; it was embalmed in the histories of Livy and Tacitus; it was imbued with life in the pages of Plutarch. To the heroes of the crusades, to the western nobles who took part in the plunder of the Romano-Byzantine empire and transmitted to their distant homes the testimony of their valour and success, none of these prizes of victory was regarded more precious than a copy of one of these ancient books. We hear nothing of classical literature previous to the Fall of the Empire in 1204; immediately afterward we hear of little else. A passion to read, to devour, the contents of these immortal books, seized upon every cultivated person.³⁰ The fabulous chronicles of the monks, the tumid legends of chivalry, the wild songs and sagas of untutored bards, were thrust aside, to make way for the more finished products of Greek and Latin thought.³¹ The myrmidons of the pontificate had spent nearly a thousand years in scouring the world for classical manuscripts, which were sent to the Vatican and there destroyed, or else mutilated, or stuffed with base forgeries. With the design to perpetuate their rule of superstition, they had deliberately built up a world of darkness, to search within which was a sin, and to look beyond it a crime; yet in a single day, the fruit of all this planting was placed in jeopardy.

The frantic efforts which they made to repair this breach, attest their sense of guilt and danger. After such long ages of repression³² the most sober treatises of antiquity became revolutionary documents; and every art was employed by the clergy to suppress them.³³ The

³⁰ "The discovery of an unknown manuscript," says Tiraboschi, "was regarded almost as the conquest of a kingdom." Hallam, 707.

³¹ "The polite literature, as well as the abstruser science of antiquity, became the subject of cultivation. Such (students) were John of Salisbury and William of Malmesbury." Hallam, 704.

³² "There is probably not a single line quoted from any poet in the Greek language from the sixth to the fourteenth century." Hallam, 708.

³³ In 1275 the booksellers of Paris were subjected to the control of the University. Hallam, 705, *n*. And the universities were subject to the control of the church. A like ordinance was doubtless promulgated in all the principal cities of christendom. Printing on paper was as yet unknown.

condemnation, by the Council of Paris in 1209, of the works of Aristotle, which had been found in Constantinople,³⁴ is only an instance of that general policy which at this period distinguished the operations of the pontificate. To uproot heresy, and this included the destruction of what was left of the ancient literature, Innocent III., extended to friars, that power of trial and condemnation, which before had been sufficiently odious in the hands of bishops.³⁵ The privilege of admission to the bedsides of the ailing and penitent, turned the whole Dominican order into an army of execrable spies, informers, and prosecutors. A million of pious Christians, Vaudois, or Albigenes, were destroyed; to say nothing of several millions of Moslems and Hebrews.³⁶ All these people had books; among which were many copies of the ancients.³⁷ All these books were burnt. More than this, the heads of Catholic families were forced or enlisted into this detestable service. Both Cola de Rienzi, Dante, and Petrarch, were diligent searchers after and restorers of ancient manuscripts. Yet the father of the latter, in his zeal to follow the behests of the church, destroyed many unique and priceless works which the learning and industry of his son had accumulated. Among these were doubtless the compendious works of Varro, which Petrarch mentions having seen in his youth, but which he afterwards lost sight of and could never recover.³⁸ Two works of Cicero, since lost, were certainly in Petrarch's possession.³⁹ The second "decade," (ten books,) of Livy, seems to have been destroyed at the same period; for that was another object of Petrarch's searches.⁴⁰ The first six books of the Annals of Tacitus, which could not be found during the Renaissance, were afterward recovered from the monastery of Corvey, in Westphalia, not over forty leagues from that other monastery where the Codex Argenteus was altered or forged.⁴¹

But happily the efforts to destroy the ancient literature were not altogether successful. Through all the mutilations to which the Roman authors were subjected, there still shone enough of the light of

³⁴ Putnam's Encyc., "Tabular Views," sub anno.

³⁵ Monastier, "Hist. of the Vaudois Church," ch. xiv. ³⁶ Monastier; Helvetius; Draper.

³⁷ Vopiscus says that the emperor Tacitus, toward the end of the third century, caused ten complete copies of the works of Tacitus, the historian, to be deposited annually in every public archive and library of the empire. Vopiscus, Tac., x. Yet not a single complete, or nearly complete, copy remains at the present day.

³⁸ Varro wrote 490 works. Of these only a fragment of a single one, (6 out of 24 libri,) is now extant.

³⁹ Matthiæ, "Greek and Rom. Lit.," p. 253.

⁴⁰ Lanciani refuses to believe that Livy was purposely mutilated or destroyed, but it must not be forgotten that this distinguished antiquarian laboured under the disadvantage of living and holding office within stone-throw of the Lateran.

⁴¹ Arthur Murphy's "Life of Tacitus," pp. xvi, etc.

the past to illumine the darkness of medieval Europe. During the first century of the Renaissance christendom lived more in twenty years than it had previously lived in five hundred, and it was during this æra of returning light that a House of Commons was established in England.

At that period there existed no witenagemote in England, nor had such a body existed for many centuries, nor was there any literature of wide repute which commemorated the witenagemote. The only existing body that might have suggested a House of Commons was the Church council, consilium. Yet, in fact, this organization was so far removed from essential resemblance to a popular legislature, that, as Mr. Rushforth relates, from epigraphical evidences, it was originally formed to practice and enforce the worship of Augustus Cæsar. The only feature of resemblance was the fact that the consilium consisted of deputies "elected by the communities of the province, meeting annually at a central temple." A House of Commons could never have developed out of a consilium. What then was the origin of the House of Commons? It arose in the same manner as did those political institutes which were erected in the seventeenth century by the Puritans of New England and the Jesuits of Paraguay. These people drew their constitutions from the Hebrew scriptures. In like manner, the modern institutes of freedom were derived from the Roman scriptures; from Livy, Cicero, Tacitus, Suetonius and the *Corpus Juris Civilis*.

The simultaneous appearance of legislative bodies in other parts of the then recently defunct Roman Empire—in every instance composed of two chambers—proves the correctness of this view. Previous to the Fall of Constantinople we find no national legislative bodies in Europe.⁴² Immediately after that event we find such bodies in almost every part of the Continent, in Spain, Gaul, Germany and Britain. Did they all spring from Saxon witenagemotes? The theory is preposterous.

They sprang from Rome, from those Roman institutes which the Hierarchy had buried, but which the fragments of classical Roman literature had preserved and resuscitated. They sprang not from the wild life of semi-barbarous and roving tribes, but from the orderly life and actual experience of a settled community of freemen, who had long disdained to live under any laws but such as they made for themselves, and who only parted with their legislature after they fell beneath the crushing weight of hierarchical tyranny.

⁴² The caricature of a (municipal) Senate in Rome forms no exception to this rule.

We have submitted many proofs that the House of Commons was not the conversion of a chieftain's or a king's council into a popular legislature, a conversion impossible under the circumstances, and unknown to the history of other countries with legislative bodies. In the *Etablissemens* of Saint Louis we read: "These Establishments were made in the Great Council of wise men and good priests."⁴³ The *witenagemote*, or great council, or *curia regis*, or parliament, of his English contemporary, Henry III., was composed in the same manner, and it exercised similar functions. The king, assisted by the advice of his council, willed so and so, to be done. Such had been a *consilium* of the Cæsars, such an imperial bench, such a Saxon *witenagemote*. It was a council, not a legislature; it assisted the deliberations of the sovereign or of his vicars, it had no independent existence, it did not represent the people. But the ancient *comitia* did; and so did the English House of Commons, whose creation, and the creation of like bodies in other European states, therefore marks the restoration of that political freedom to the Roman world, which had expired in the triumph of Julius Cæsar, and was resurrected upon the Fall of his Empire in 1204.

⁴³ *Recueil des Ordonnances*, tom. I, p. 51.

CHAPTER X.

TRIAL BY JURY.

The jury system was unknown to Oriental nations—It arose with liberty in Greece and fell with liberty in Rome—Juries of Ten—of Twelve—The system was subverted by the patricians and ecclesiastics during the reign of Sylla—Destroyed by Julius Cæsar—Imperial Assessores—Ecclesiastical Compurgatores—Resuscitation of the jury system after the Fall of the Sacred Empire.

THE essence of the Jury System is the determination of questions of fact, arising in courts of law, by a body of citizens, of the same political rank as the litigants, or the accused, such citizens not being permanent magistrates and returning to the body of the people, when their work is done. Its origin is to be found in the dicasts of Athens, appointed under the institutes of Solon. When the Roman Commonwealth arose, that is to say, a little more than a century after the æra of Solon, the jury system was transplanted into the constitution of that rising state; and there it remained until the downfall of freedom. It was in the consulship of Publicola, A.U. 245, that the citizen was accorded the right to appeal from the decision of a magistrate, which at that period meant a patrician, to the judgment of his peers in the comitia,¹ and this provision is regarded as the basis of the Roman system of trial by jury. At first only important cases were thus appealed, and the jury consisted of the whole comitia, at that time the Centuriata. When the state became more populous and jury cases more numerous, the comitia, now the Tributa, appears to have relegated all appeals, except those of a political or of a probate character, to the Centuriata. This body proved false to the trust. It selected as judges three hundred of its own number, including among them many of senatorial rank, and thus altered the basis of the system. For the hearing of ordinary cases ten jurymen were drawn from the three hundred, and panels of such jurors appear to have been attached to the various courts, at least such seems to have been the case about

¹ Livy, II, 8; Plutarch, in Publicola. The right to be tried for capital offences before the Comitia appears in the Twelve Tables.

A. U. 604. Like the dicasts of Athens, the jury were summoned by *præcones*, or criers; ² the jury occupied in the court-room a seat by themselves situated below the tribunal of the *prætor*, and called *subsellia*; ³ they were addressed by pleaders, as "Gentlemen of the Jury;" ⁴ they retired to consult upon their verdict; they voted by ballots, of which in criminal cases, there were three sorts, inscribed respectively, Guilty, Not Guilty, and not Proven; they had a foreman, *princeps*; they took an oath before each trial to be governed in their verdict only by the evidence adduced before them; and the accused, or the defendant, was allowed to challenge and reject a certain number, whose places were filled up from the panel. The period, when the numbers which composed a petty jury was changed from ten to twelve, is uncertain, probably after the Decemvirate. The term of service for jurymen was one year and they were not obliged to serve during the holidays, or New Year's festivals. ⁵

About the year A. U. 513, the *Tributa*, without relinquishing its privilege to try political cases or appeals by a jury of the whole house, referred all cases concerning testaments and inheritance, or as we would now call them, probate cases, to a panel consisting of three citizens chosen from each of the thirty-five tribes, therefore, strictly speaking, 105 in all. These were called *centumviri*, and the causes that came before them, *causæ centumvirales*. Their number was afterward increased to 180. ⁶ Kennett, p. 136, is of opinion that out of this body were drawn the *arbitri* and *recuperatores*. From the decision of a *centumviral* jury there was no appeal.

Under these arrangements most of the jury trials came to be decided by the patricians and influenced by the ecclesiastics, a result that gave rise to frequent exhibitions of popular dissatisfaction. It essentially overthrew the ancient institute of *Publicola* and delivered the citizen not to the judgement of his peers, but to the hereditary enemies of liberty. Tacitus, himself a patrician and a priest, informs us that this subject was for ages the cause of civil commotion in the Roman state, until it was settled by the *lex Sempronia*, A. U. 632. By virtue of this law a Roman citizen could only be tried for his life by the *comitia*, whose jurymen were to be drawn altogether from the *equites*, a middle rank of citizens, open to any person of respecta-

² The criers (*præcones*) were also organized in bodies of ten (*decuriæ*). Adam, 147.

³ Suet., Nero, 17.

⁴ Cic., Orat.

⁵ Suet., in Galba, 14.

⁶ Pliny's Letters, VI, 23. The Julian court appears to have been a *centumviral*, or probate court, and may have been the prototype of the *curia regis*, or king's bench, of Augustus.

bility and means.⁷ This was not the restoration of Publicola's system, but a compromise, the best that the people could then obtain.

The *lex Servilia*, A. U. 648, increased the number of citizens available as jurymen to 450, by adding 150 of the patrician class; the *lex Glaucia*, A. U. 653, again limited these 450 to the equites; the *lex Livius*, A. U. 662, increased the number to 600, by adding 150 of the patrician class; by a subsequent law this additional number was compelled to be drawn from the equites only; while the *lex Plautius*, A. U. 664, limited the whole number to 525 citizens drawn from the patrician, equestrian and plebeian orders, though in what proportion, we are not advised. Cicero, who is our informant in this matter, merely says that fifteen citizens were drawn from each tribe. We have multiplied this number by the whole number of tribes, but it is possible that all the tribes were not permitted to supply jurymen and therefore that the whole number was less than that assumed above.

With the triumph of Sylla's arms, the jury system, together with many other institutes of freedom, received a fatal blow. By the *lex Cornelia*, A. U. 672, he reduced the jurymen to 300 *selecti*, drawn exclusively from the senatorial class. This law made them practically what would now be called justices, rather than jurymen. They were no longer called upon to decide merely the fact, but also the law; they were no longer drawn from the same rank as the accused, or defendant, but were all aristocrats and possessors of great estates; they no longer received legal instructions from the prætor, but consulted and coöperated with him as equals; indeed many of them were professional lawyers and advocates, and, as can be seen from several coins of the period, they sat upon the same bench as the prætor.

With this enlargement of function they seem to have acquired the name of *assessores*. Dr. Adam very correctly renders the *assessores* into the *consilium*, or the counsellors, or council, of the prætor; but is he also correct in supposing that while the *assessores* sat upon the bench with the prætor, a jury, (*judices*,) sat on the *subsellia* below? This seems to us like mingling or confusing the customs of different ages. Pliny, the Younger, writes to Cornelius Tacitus:⁸ "It has frequently been my province to act both as an advocate and a *judex*, and I have often also attended as an *assessor*;" thus apparently distinguishing between them and assigning them to different periods of his life. Yet the passage is neither clear nor conclusive. In a letter

⁷ Tac., *Annals*, XII, 60. Montesquieu evidently had this passage in mind when he said that in the wars between Marius and Sylla the composition of juries formed the chief bone of contention.

⁸ Letters, I, 20.

to Rufus, he says: "I lately attended our excellent emperor (Trajan) as one of his assessores, in a cause wherein he himself presided." * * * "When the opinions of the assessores was taken *** it was decided," etc.⁹ But not a word about any jury. It is true that Pliny's evidence is of a negative character, and that it relates to a period nearly two centuries later than Sylla; yet nevertheless it may throw some light upon this point. Possibly in the transition from the jury system of the Commonwealth to the assessore system of the empire, there was an interval, when, indeed, ten (or twelve) judices sat upon the sub-sellia, but bereft of any more important function than that of determining such questions, special issues, as might be put to them by the bench; or, like the assessores of the existing British admiralty courts, the older system may for a time, have overlapped the newer.

The *lex Cottia*, A. U. 683, drew the *selecti* from the senators, equites, and *tribuni ærarii*; the *lex Licinia*, or *Aurelia*, A. U. 698, drew a jury, in cases of bribery at elections, from the people at large, *ex omni populo*; ¹⁰ but as such cases, that is to say, wherein the bribery was susceptible of proof, must have been comparatively rare,¹¹ this cannot be regarded as any substantial renewal of the jury system. In A. U. 702, the number of the *selecti* was still 300, as appears by a resolution of the senate preserved verbatim in a letter of Marcus Cœlius to Cicero.¹² It also appears that a number of them were also members of the senate. In the same year Pompey increased the number of *selecti* to 360 and probably made some popular concessions toward a return of the old system, which concessions were repealed after his tragic death.

Julius Cæsar limited the *selecti* to the senatorial and equestrian orders,¹³ drawing three *decuriæ*, each of a different class of fortunes, from each tribe. Marc Antony, in A. U. 710, increased the number of *selecti* by drawing a supplementary panel from the centurions of the army.¹⁴ Augustus added a fourth *decuria* from each tribe, consisting of a class called *ducenarii*, because the official value of their estates was only 200,000 sesterces, or half that of an equite; and he reduced the age of eligibility from 25 to 20 years. The appeals which formerly were decided by a jury of the *Centuriata*, he referred to the decision of the prætor; and he, or his divine predecessor, constituted a *curia regis*, or court of king's bench, in which the sov-

⁹ Pliny's Letters, IV, 22. See also on this subject, Letters, VI, 22, and VI, 31.

¹⁰ Cic., *Planc.*, 17.

¹¹ Pliny says that political bribery was now carried on "with more secrecy." Letters, VI, 19.

¹² Letters, II, 4.

¹³ Suet., *Jul.*, 41.

¹⁴ Cic., *Phil.*, I and V.

ereign himself sat in judgment in important cases, assisted by a concilium or bench of assessores.¹⁵ This is the kind of court mentioned by Pliny. Its establishment practically marks the downfall of the jury system.

Some allusion has already been made to the mingling of customs belonging to different ages, which possibly pertains to Dr. Adam's account of the Roman system of judices. This remark may with equal justice be applied to the accounts of the Romans themselves. The number of judices in a panel, the number drawn from a panel, and the number of tribes from which they were drawn, all belong to different ages, yet the Roman historians never noticed this circumstance. For example, the number 300 has a sacerdotal significance and it belongs to the remotest age of Rome. During the best ages of the Commonwealth it was disregarded. When the Commonwealth was about to expire superstition had resumed its sway and the ancient sacerdotal number of selecti was reinstated in the institutes of the dying republic. The number of tribes, 35, also belongs to an early period of Roman history, when that number agreed with the days of the month and the pantheon of the minor gods. Yet it was retained long after it had lost all significance. On the change from 10 to 12 jurymen we have already offered an opinion. With these mysteries we have at present no concern, further than to suggest them as illustrations of the confusion into which the evolution of its religious belief threw many of the institutes of Rome and the resulting difficulties which have attended the efforts of modern historians and antiquarians to describe such institutes with precision.

It is essential to again remark, in respect of trial by jury, that it was totally unknown to the Orient. Neither the Hindus, Chinese, Tatars, Persians, Assyrians, Hebrews, nor Egyptians possessed any such institute, nor do their descendents, to this day. It was born with Grecian and perished with Roman liberty; and was only resuscitated when the hierarchy, which had crushed out that liberty, was itself overthrown.

¹⁵ Suet., Aug., 32.

CHAPTER XI.

THE WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS.

Its origin in Greece—In Rome—Its abolition during the Hierarchy—Its resuscitation after the Fall of Constantinople—Subsequent history.

THIS is a writ which compels any person who has been deprived of his liberty, to be brought before a public magistrate, in order that it may be determined whether or not he has been lawfully imprisoned. The origin of this writ is commonly traced to the Middle Ages. In fact it may be traced to the æra of Solon and the Athenian republic, when "the rights of citizenship, representation in the legislature, trial by jury, (dicasts,) the writ of habeas corpus, marriage laws, and many other institutes of freedom and civilization" were secured to the people.¹

In Rome, A. U. 259, B. C. 495, on the ides, or middle day of May, now called Whitsuntide, a temple to Liber Pater (Bacchus) was erected near the Circus Maximus, probably to commemorate the passage of an act which we now perceive to have resembled the modern Habeas Corpus. Anciently the Roman creditor had the right to seize and imprison the person of his debtor. In that year, owing to certain affecting circumstances, which are narrated by Livy, the Consul issued an edict that "no person should hold any Roman citizen in bonds or confinement, so as to hinder his being brought before the Consuls."² Who can doubt the essential resemblance between this law and the Habeas Corpus Act?

In A. U. 429, B. C. 325, the phraseology of this important law was made broader. The Pætelian law made it a misdemeanor to detain any person in custody or confinement unless as a punishment for crime and after lawful conviction.³

Finally, in A. U. 632, B. C. 122, the Sempronian law provided that no sentence should be passed upon a Roman citizen unless by virtue of law or warrant of the Comitia.⁴ The safeguards which these various

¹ "The Worship of Augustus Cæsar," sub anno, B. C. 592.

² Ibid, p. 147.

³ Livy, VIII, 28.

⁴ Cicero pro Rabir., 4.

enactments threw around the citizen were even more complete than those furnished by the mediæval writ of Habeas Corpus. They not only provided that the prisoner should be brought before a magistrate to determine whether he had been lawfully imprisoned or not; they provided a severe penalty for unlawful detention, a penalty that under the Sempronian law would have reached the magistrate himself.

It will be observed that by the Pætelian Law it was a misdemeanor to detain any person in custody or confinement, unless as a punishment for crime and after lawful conviction; and that by the Sempronian Law, no sentence could be passed upon a Roman citizen, unless by virtue of the law, or warrant of the Comitia. These laws, especially the former one, were designed to protect the personal liberty of the citizen and to shield him from unlawful detention or imprisonment. Such was also the design of that clause in Magna Charta which provides that "no man shall be taken or imprisoned but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land." Between these dates there elapsed more than thirteen centuries of time, there were held more than thirteen hundred ecclesiastical convocations and other councils, but there was no law to protect the person from unlawful seizure or imprisonment. Such an institute will be sought for in vain among barbarian or hierarchical constitutions. Like the House of Commons and the Jury system, it arose out of the actual experience of a free people, it belonged to æras of political liberty, it was lost in the long and horrible night of pontifical ascendancy, it was found when that darkness disappeared. The hierarchy fell in 1204; Magna Charta was granted in 1215.^b

Observe the difference between an actual and an imaginary Commonwealth. These institutes of Greece and Rome, though deprived of nourishment for more than a thousand years, have all sprung up again and flourish to-day. Those of the Judean poets, though planted in Asia, in Europe, in New England, in Paraguay, have rarely, no matter upon what occasion, or with whatever assistance, enjoyed more than a sickly growth of a few years.

The argument that the House of Commons arose out of the witenagemote, originated in the church, whence it was carried into the universities, over all of which the Church exercised a jealous supervision. From the universities it flowed out into the pages of those historians whom the universities have furnished to the modern world. In a similar manner, the jury system was traced to the compurgators of the canon law, and the principle of the Habeas Corpus act to some

^b A Habeas Corpus act was passed by the Senate of Venice and became the law of that Commonwealth in A. D. 1275. Hazlitt's "Venice," ed. 1858, II, 411.

remote and undefined ordinance of the dark ages. But no such tree ever bore such fruit. Let it be understood that to attribute these institutes to the dark or the medieval ages, is to attribute them to the Hierarchy; because during the whole of those periods the Hierarchy ruled supreme. Let it be understood that during these periods the commons were slaves, the courts of law were the dungeons and torture-chambers of the Inquisition, and that the persons, not merely of commoners, but of kings, were buried alive, in conventual tombs, at pleasure of some of the most blasphemous and murderous tyrants the world ever saw. Finally, let it be understood that to clothe the detested laws and devices of these tyrants in the fair garb of free institutes, is to hide from posterity the danger of their re-enactment and expose it to the insidious advances of another race of hierarchs.⁶ When these things are understood, the arguments which have been brought forward to sustain the ecclesiastical view of the origin of legislatures, juries, and laws to protect the person, will die the miserable death they deserve.

⁶ "The commission appointed to consider the means to be adopted for checking the spread of Stundism in the south of Russia recommends that all religious assemblies or meetings of the sect be forbidden, since they are calculated to promote false teaching and to promote a state of nervous exaltation among the ignorant classes of the people. It is also proposed that the ecclesiastical authorities compel those who are suffering from undue religious excitement to enter a monastery, where they may be confined until they are restored to a healthier and more normal state." St. Petersburg despatch, in *London Daily Chronicle*, September 6th, 1892.

CHAPTER XII.

THE PREROGATIVE OF MONEY.

Early Roman monetary systems—Numerical System of B.C. 385—Prosperity of the republic—Dissatisfaction of the patricians—Alexander's plunder of Asia—Metallic flood—Profits of Oriental trade—Attacks upon the Numerical system—Adoption of a "Species" system—Decline of the metallic flood—Distress in Rome—Theory of Money—Punic wars—Conquest of Greece—Distress relieved—Rise of prices—Halcyon Age—Dwindling of metallic resources—Renewal of distress—Gentes, or private-coinage system, copied from Greece—This device arrests the decline which, however, is soon renewed—Civil Wars—End of the republic—Monetary systems of the Empire—Fall of the Empire in A.D. 1204—Assertion of the Roman prerogative of money by the Christian kings of Europe—Review of the Prerogative—Its descent traced from ancient Rome to modern Britain.

ACCORDING to the latest researches into the antiquities of Rome, the monetary systems which it employed before the Gaulish Invasion were: First, the ace grave, with leather notes to represent the ingots; Second, the ace signatum; and Third, the silver (and copper) coin system mentioned by Varro in Charisius, the silver coins called *denarii*, weighing each about 118 English grains; specimens of them being still extant. These researches also disclose the fact that Pliny wrote in ignorance of the early monetary systems of his country, from which it may be further inferred that the most ancient Roman coinage laws were no longer extant in his day. As these laws have not even yet come to light, we have no means to determine precisely under what conditions or circumstances the earlier Roman coinages were issued. There is, however, reason to believe that the "Romano" silver coins, which appear to have been included in the system alluded to by Varro, were issued upon somewhat the same plan as are our gold coins at the present time; they were manufactured by the State, probably upon a "retinue," or seigniorage, but at the request and pleasure of private individuals, who melted them down or else exported them to foreign countries whenever they would fetch more as bullion than they cost as coins, or whenever they would purchase more commodities abroad than at home.

About the period of the Gaulish Invasion, B. C. 385, the extension of the Roman domain, the excellence of the Roman roads, the facility of travel and intercommunication throughout all parts of the Republic, and the organization of credit, rendered the Roman coins so efficient an instrument of exchange that to leave their emission and subsequent destruction or exportation any longer subject to the pleasure of private individuals, imperilled the welfare of society and the safety of the State. At all events, laws were evidently enacted at this juncture which worked a most notable change in the monetary system of the Republic. These laws are described at length in the author's "History of Money in Ancient States."

In effect, the Roman Republic resumed its ancient prerogative of Money; it stopped the fabrication of coins for private account; it retired the outstanding issues, and established an entirely new system of money, consisting of over-valued bronze coins, called *nummi*, which were struck by the government only for itself. The value of these *nummi* was preserved by limiting their emission to a fixed sum.

Systems of this character, called Numerical systems, had been tried, with more or less success, in certain states of the Orient, also in Sparta, Byzantium, Clazomenæ, and Athens. The great teachers of philosophy and politics, such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno, had written upon the subject of Numerical systems of money; while Plato, the most revered of them all, had recommended such a system for his Ideal Republic. Whatever diverse opinions were held in Rome as to the substance of which the tokens or symbols of money should best be made, whether of gold, silver, or bronze, or of all combined, or whether the issues should be convertible or not, it seems to have been determined by the Comitia Tributa, which at this period was supreme, that the safety of the Republic was imperilled by the control which individuals had previously exercised over the coinage; and that in order to avoid this peril it had become necessary for the State, that is to say the people, as represented in the Comitia, to take the emissions of money into its own hands.

For the sake of rendering it familiar to the reader, it may be said that the Numerical or Nummular system of republican Rome was rudely reflected in the Greenback system of the United States of America, 1862-78. In the Roman system the greenbacks, or *nummi*, were printed, that is to say stamped, on bronze; the metal being worth only about one-fifth of the value expressed in legal denominations assigned to and stamped upon each piece. The government alone issued the *nummi*. In order to defeat counterfeiting, the copper mines were

monopolized by the State; the commerce in copper and tin was regulated; the designs for the issues of nummi were of great artistic beauty; the emissions were limited; the pieces were stamped S. C., or *ex Senatus Consulto*; and they were made the sole legal tenders for the payment of taxes, contracts, fines, and debts. In the American greenback system the emissions were not limited constitutionally, but only by Congress; they were not the sole legal-tenders issued by the government, because customs-duties and interest on the public debt were allowed, and indeed required, to be paid in coins; and the law authorizing the issue of greenbacks was not so clear in regard to their inconvertibility as to avoid dispute on this point—a dispute that ended with their being gratuitously rendered convertible.

The Roman system of nummi continued in successful use for nearly a century, during which interval Rome rose from the condition of an obscure state to that of the Mistress of all Italy. But such general prosperity did not satisfy the patrician class. They wanted the prosperity, but they wanted it for themselves alone, and were unwilling to share it with the people at large, because such communism deprived them of the wealth and social distinction they coveted. As the nummular system stood in the way of these aspirations, they condemned, attacked, undermined, and eventually overthrew it; and that, too, with the ignorant acquiescence of the very people at large whose welfare it had so signally advanced and whose liberties it had conserved.

The movement for the overthrow of the nummular system was greatly favored by the Oriental conquests of Alexander the Great and the immense quantities of the precious metals which these conquests yielded to Macedon and the contiguous Greek States and their colonies, including Magna Græcia in Italy. These countries were flooded with the coins of the conqueror, which even to this day are not so rare as are American coins of the last century. From Magna Græcia the coins of Alexander soon made their way to Rome, where their superior convenience over the nummi for the payment of large sums must have recommended them to favour. The immense profits which were to be made both before and during this period, by exchanging European silver for Asiatic gold, could scarcely have been without influence in encouraging a return to "species" payments. In connection with a period so early as B. C. 357 Livy alludes to an *aurum vicesimarium*, which appears to have been a tax upon imported gold. These circumstances blinded the Romans to the mischievous, the retrogressive tendencies of Barter, for such is the nature of a "species" system, when unsupported by fiduciary issues. The grow-

ing power of the Senate and waning power of the Comitia at this period lent facility to the proposed change. The patricians saw what seemed to them an advantage over the commons, and they seized a favourable moment to grasp it.

In B.C. 317 was enacted the monetary law of Ogulnius and Fabius, which erected a species system of gold, silver and bronze coins, based upon a silver sesterce of 18.229 English grains, of which sesterces, 80 went to the gold aureus of 145.833 grains, a weight-ratio of silver to gold equal to 10 for 1. This system may have been permissive and not compulsory, or it may have been in some manner coupled with the Nummulary system, so as to conceal the radical nature of the change. Be this as it may, it eventually superseded the Nummulary altogether and thus transferred the Prerogative of Money (for this was the real object aimed at and achieved) from the supervision of the Comitia to that of the Senate, in other words, from the hands of the people to those of the patricians.

So long as the flood of precious metals from the Orient and the Greek states continued to pour into Rome, the evil effects of surrendering the Prerogative of Money were not perceived. The moment when this flood ceased and especially when the flood became a flux, which it did during the first quarter of the third century before our æra, then there arose from the people cries of regret, distress and apprehension. The language of Pliny, where he condemns those who introduced gold and silver into the money of Rome, of having committed a Crime against Mankind, was not justified by any circumstances relating to the money of his own time; it must have been copied from some chronicler of an earlier period, probably from Timæus, who wrote about B.C. 290, a period when the retreating tide of metallic money left the wreck of the neglected Prerogative exposed to view. If applied to that period the condemnation was essentially just; yet the Crime was not so much in substituting gold and silver tokens for bronze tokens, as in substituting gold and silver *metal* for bronze *money*; in substituting Commodities, which could be coined up and melted down by their individual owners at pleasure and with little or no loss, in the place of Money, which could not thus be treated without great and irreparable loss; in supplementing the bronze nummi, which under State regulation formed a fixed and known proportion of the whole currency, with gold and silver pieces, the latter being amenable to private control and bearing no fixed or known proportion to the Volume of money employed in the exchanges. The Crime against Mankind was in depriving the state of its Prerogative of

Money, to bestow it upon a favoured class of the population. It was the same crime that in 1666 Charles II. committed in England and in 1790 Alexander Hamilton committed in the United States by recommending his government to adopt the system of Charles II.

Nations may grow rich with a Barter system; (and let it be understood that the gratuitous or nearly gratuitous and unlimited coinage of money, when coupled with free meltage and export, whether the coins are of gold, silver, copper, or any other metal, and when unsupported by fiduciary issues, must result in simple Barter for the metal thus coined;) but such wealth cannot become equitably diffused among the productive classes. It will inevitably become congested; and for the most part it will gravitate not towards merit and industry, but towards combination, conspiracy and idleness. The Messiah declared that the rich could not hope to enter the Kingdom of heaven, not merely because they were rich, but evidently because, as the laws then stood, and it may be added, as they now again stand, wealth was too often gained unworthily.

Moreover, the wealth that is gained under legal enactments which rob the state of its Prerogative of Money (that is to say, enactments which permit gratuitous and unlimited coinage, free meltage, unrestricted exportation, etc.,) is a petty wealth compared with what would accrue from commerce and exchange when not hampered by such enactments. For the sake of illustration, let it be supposed that with a gratuitously coined, unlimited metallic currency of 1000 millions, (of any denomination) having a velocity in the exchanges of once a week, is coupled a mass of credits, which, when reduced to a like velocity of once a week, would amount to another 1000 millions, total 2000 millions. Upon this hypothesis, the sum of exchanges, at 50 weeks to the year, would necessarily amount to 100 thousand millions. Let us further assume that the net profits on these exchanges were 5 per cent and that the just proportion of such profits accruing respectively to capital and labour was each one-half. It would follow that each would receive 2500 millions.

Now a gratuitous and unlimited coinage is subject to this grave defect: it is liable to be suddenly and greatly augmented by accessions from the mines, or by importations from abroad; to say nothing of treasure-trove, melted plate, etc. It is on the other hand, liable to be suddenly and greatly diminished by melting, hoarding, absorption in the arts, or exportations of bullion to foreign countries, to say nothing of wear and tear, losses by shipwreck, etc. Thus the currency, together with the whole mass of credits built upon it, is subject to

enormous variation, a variation which now-a-days reflects itself primarily in the prices of marketable securities, shares in corporations, bonds and debentures, secondarily in the prices of all commodities according to the order of their marketability, and lastly in the sum of wages paid for labour. When men, whether capitalists or stipendiaries, are subject to such circumstances and conditions, they dare not venture upon new enterprises, however meritorious, for fear of being caught with too slender a bank balance and forced into insolvency. They are compelled to be conservative, overcautious and pennywise. The general result of such conservatism is a slower movement of money, and a smaller number of exchanges, than would attend a fixed and stable currency. The latter, not being subject on the one hand to meltage or exportation, nor on the other to mining or importation, would safely sustain a greater mass of credits and yet move more rapidly. A state-regulated and stable currency of 1000 millions would safely bear, let us say, twice as many credits as a gratuitous-coinage and free-meltage currency of the same nominal amount. The sum of money, 1000 millions, plus credits when reduced to a like velocity, together 2000 millions, would amount to a volume of 3000 millions. All elements of fluctuation being now eliminated from the currency, men would no longer fear to promote meritorious enterprises merely because they were new; they would cast aside their pennywise policy and deal promptly and frequently. Transactions would multiply, money would move rapidly; and instead of a velocity of once a week, it would assume a velocity of, let us say, twice a week. A currency of 3000 millions moving twice a week will result in exchanges amounting to 300 thousand millions. Suppose, as before, that the profits were 5 per cent, but that Capital only got a third instead of a half, how much would it receive? Answer: 5000 millions, or just double as much as under the unregulated coinage, or species, or Barter system. On the other hand, Labour would receive 10,000 millions, or four times as much as under the Barter system. In short, the species system, which Capital deludes itself in supposing to be advantageous, really robs it of half its due rewards; whilst Labour is robbed of three-fourths of what it would receive under a regulated or Numerical system.

When the Numerical system of the Roman Republic is thoughtfully examined, and when the rapid developement, the agricultural, mining and commercial activity, the enormous accumulation of wealth, and the vast strides in science, invention and the arts, which characterized the Romans during and shortly after the employment of this system, are considered, it will scarcely be denied that these evidences of

progress were due in some measure to that system. It was an evil day for Rome when the Numerical system was abandoned and Pliny (or Timæus) was right when he regarded the surrender of the Prerogative of Money to private individuals as a Crime against Mankind.

The historians of the Republic have left us little room to doubt that the distress which followed the cessation of the Oriental flood of the precious metals had much to do with forcing Rome into the Punic wars; indeed, in rendering popular any wars that promised to supply the Republic with the needed materials for coinage. It may even be surmised that the patricians—in order to divert the Commons from the consideration of monetary pressure—did all they could to provoke Carthage to the conquest. The Punic wars were begun by Rome B.C. 265. They ended B.C. 202, with the total subversion of its rival, the capture of colossal spoil, in gold and silver, and the acquisition of the Spanish mines. These resources, when coupled with those afforded by the subsequent conquest of Greece, furnished such ample relief from the dwindling stock of money, that prices rose to a higher level than before; the Romans forgot their apprehensions; and a new æra of prosperity began; an æra so brilliant and hopeful as to earn for itself the name of the Halcyon Age.

But there is no stability in a Barter system, and it makes no essential difference whether the barter is for gold, silver, or any other commodity, as such. Sooner or later it must come to judgment. With an increasing and prosperous population, it requires for its support an augmentation of the precious metals great enough to supply the mints, satisfy the arts, fill the channels of export, and withstand the wear-and-tear of coins. Mining is unequal to this demand, while conquest and spoliation can only meet it for a time. After Rome had plundered the states of the Levant of all the precious metals which could be found, a scarcity of money again made itself felt; and the public distress became so marked that relief was sought in still another downward step of the Prerogative of Money. Under the old system of B.C. 317 the precious metals were coined apparently without limit, though not gratuitously. The Republic charged a seigniorage for coining; and it reserved, if it did not exercise, some further control over the coinage. It was resolved about B. C. 175, at least so far as silver was concerned, to throw away all control and permit the patricians to strike their own coins, whenever, and with what devices and to as great an extent, as they liked. This measure, like most of the monetary legislation of Rome, was borrowed from Greece. For proof of this, see a passage in Xenophon, ed. 1877, p. 686. It was doubtless

resorted to in Rome in the hope of inducing the wealthy to coin their plate. This expectation, and the pressure of the times, rendered acceptable private issues of silver coins which otherwise would have met with popular contempt and resentment; for the patricians took care to stamp upon them the evidences of their rank and the bases of their pretensions. For a while the expedient succeeded; but the paucity of gentes coins which were struck before the first century B. C., is an evidence that the measure met with little success. The patricians evidently did not deem it advantageous to increase the currency; and until the following century, during the civil wars, the output of their private coining-presses was comparatively small. Under these circumstances the currency steadily diminished; and before the middle of the century the Halcyon Age was over.

The decline of the Republic now suffered but little interruption. The last resort had been tried and failed. There were no more rich countries to plunder; mining could not keep pace with the demands of trade for the materials of money; and trade had to decline. With it, declined production, profit, credit, and the social ties which arise from commercial prosperity. In the course of a little more than another century, the Republic fell to rise no more; and with it fell for more than fifteen centuries, the aspirations of mankind for justice, freedom and protection.

Under the Empire the Prerogative of Money was partly reserved by the State; though even this reservation was only effected indirectly. The sovereign-pontiff monopolized the coinage of gold and fixed the weight-ratio of value between gold and silver at 1 to 12; a ratio which remained unaltered for over 1200 years. He shared the coinage of silver with his subject kingdoms and left the coinage of bronze to the Senate and municipalities. According to Epictetus, *Dissertations*, 1, xxix, all these coins were legal-tender; but it may be presumed that with regard to the bronze coins, their legal-tender was limited. Under these conditions the Volume of Money fluctuated with the productivity of mines and this with the conquest of populous countries and the supply of slaves. Pliny complained of the vast sums of silver which in his own day were drained away to Asia; Aurelian, at the cost of 7000 troops, defeated the private coiners and resumed the Prerogative of silver, which, however, was lost again in subsequent reigns; several of the emperors issued edicts against the absorption of the precious metals in the arts. Diocletian attempted to establish a tariff of prices—*edictum pretiam*—whilst many other evidences appear from time to time in the annals of the Empire which prove that the cur-

rency almost continually declined and as continually gave rise to social disorders.

Sir Archibald Alison and Mr. William Jacob have written learned and laborious treatises to prove that the decay of the Empire was due to the shrinkage of its metallic currency and the failure of its mines. They might have gone much further and shown that before the Empire, the Republic failed from similar causes. So long as the Comitia retained its vitality, so long did the Republic, through its legislative action, retain the Prerogative of money; and so long were production and trade promoted. There can be discerned no evidences of decay in the Roman state at this period. But the moment the Senate succeeded in depriving the Comitia of its powers, the moment it seized the Prerogative of money and altered the Numerical to a Barter system, marks of retrogression made their appearance. The metallic flood, gained from trade with the Greek states, which in turn gained it from Alexander's conquests in the Orient and the further flood of the metals wrested from the despairing hands of Greece itself, hid these marks for a time and converted a degenerate into a progressive age of Rome. But when these stimuli lost their force, the old disease once more appeared; and the decline of the Commonwealth continued until agrarian disturbances and civil wars ingloriously terminated its career. The vigorous and prudent measures of Julius and Augustus helped for a lengthy period to sustain an empire where a republic had fallen; but as the case stood, their measures could only be half-measures and the result was that the empire declined as the republic had declined before it. After dying many deaths, after convulsions so vast that the world never witnessed their like before, and it is to be hoped will never witness their like again, this mighty Empire, finally expired with the capture of Constantinople, A. D. 1204.

Immediately after this event, as if to emphasize the tremendous importance of the coinage Prerogative, every petty monarch within the Roman pale began to coin gold; an act which no one of them had ever before ventured to commit; in short, they took up and exercised that Prerogative of gold which the dead Empire had held from first to last, but which owing to the proconsular and monarchical coinages of silver and the municipal coinages of bronze, had long been shorn of its once superior importance. Among those who first struck gold at this period were the Kings of Leon, A. D. 1225; Portugal, 1225; France, 1226; England, 1257; Bohemia and Poland, 1300, and the Dukes or Counts of Florence, 1252; Genoa, 1252; Flanders, 1265, and Venice, 1276.

Will any one pretend to say that the assumption of this potent and

significant Prerogative by Henry III. was an heritage from the Anglo-Saxon kings and not from Rome? If so, then let it also be shown by such pretenders why that Prerogative was laid aside, disused and never exercised during the whole of the five hundred years which separated the pagan Anglo-Saxon kings from the Fall of Constantinople.

The truth is that the British Prerogative of money has no other source than the right of the Roman Comitia to control the issues of money, both gold, silver and bronze; that when the Comitia was deprived of this right, it was usurped by the Senate and afterwards surrendered to the gentes; that Cæsar preserved and exalted the Prerogative of gold (only) for the Empire; that the Empire held it until its overthrow in 1204; that the Prerogative of silver was conferred by Cæsar upon the proconsuls; that the proconsuls eventually became kings, who exercised this Prerogative of money and this one, (the silver prerogative,) alone; none of them venturing to strike either gold or bronze; that the Prerogative of bronze was conferred by Cæsar upon the municipalities, who exercised it down to, and in some cases after, the Fall of the Empire; and that the first King of England who exercised all three, namely, the Prerogatives of gold, of silver, and of base metal, whether bronze or tin, was Henry III.

Such is a brief outline of the right of the House of Commons to control the issues of money; a right which came from the Comitia. The English kings who exercised it before the Commons did, got it from the Roman Empire; the Empire got it from the gentes; the gentes from the Senate; and the Senate from the Comitia, *ex senatus consulto*. The Prerogative of money in England cannot be traced to any other source, neither from the witenagemote, nor from popular custom. The singular abstention from the coinage both of gold and bronze for upwards of 500 years, an abstention which was observed not only by the kings of England but also by those of every other state of Christendom, forms an absolute bar to any such plea.

CHAPTER XIII.

RISE OF THE GOTHIC POWER ON THE CONTINENT.

The ancient Getæ of the Oxus and Euxine—Their removal to Illyria—The Gots of northern Europe, an allied race of later date—Their origin—Their appearance in Russia, Finland, Sweden, Iesthonia, Saxony, Gaul, and Britain—They fall under Roman sway—Their revolts against Roman authority—The empire of Ivan Vidfami extends from Novgorod to Northumbria.

WE have been taught that northern Europe during the Dark Ages, was invaded by rapidly successive hosts of strange barbarians, countless as the sands, divided into innumerable tribes, having little or no relation to one another, and connected by no tie except the common desire to plunder, depopulate, and overthrow the Roman empire. Precisely whence these hosts came, how they supported themselves in the deserts and forests which encircled the empire, whence they procured their arms, or what magic produced the discipline, order and unity of purpose so necessary to attack or resist such formidable foes as the Romans, we are not informed. The archæological remains indicate no innumerable hosts, no rapidly successive invaders, no countless tribes of strangers in northern Europe. They point to a sparse population of Goths, Slavs, Alemanni and Huns, every petty tribe of whom has been magnified by vanity, fear, prejudice, or imposture into a nation of giants and devourers. We are not concerned herein with the Slavs, Alemanni, or Huns; but with regard to the Goths of the Baltic, had the Roman chronicles not been perverted through conceit and superstition, the Romans might have recognized in these people the same race whom their forefathers had reduced to subjection in Mœsia, hacked to pieces in Illyria, driven away from the Loire and subjected to slavery in Britain; the broad-shouldered, fair-haired, blue-eyed worshippers of the Sun and Woden; that race against whom the Brahminical priests of the Romans had taught them not only to wage war but carry it to extermination.

To trace the rise of the Sacæ or the Getæ in Europe generally would be beside the objects of this volume; but as according to the views

of certain eminent authors, the chronicles of this race at a remote period, were those of Europe itself, it may conduce to a better understanding of the early Norse occupation of Britain, if some allusion to these views are made in this place. History has been so greatly perverted by the Greek and Roman ecclesiastics that to our eyes every truth revealed by archæology seems preposterous and every fact stands topsy-turvy. We have been taught, for example, to regard Greece (and after it Rome) as the centre of the civilized world and the original source of its activity, whilst the Sacæ was a host of predatory savages, of comparatively modern origin, who hovered upon the borders of this world, ready to tear it to pieces from mere love of plunder and slaughter. On the contrary, the monuments of Egypt and Asia Minor, which in recent years have been discovered for the first time in more than twenty-five centuries, and therefore during that interval could neither have been forged nor altered, afford us reasons to suspect that the Sacæ were the original discoverers of Europe; that they occupied it before either Greece or Rome had any national existence; that these barbarians were the original colonizers of Hellas, upon which they conferred language, the runic letters, religion, government and a distinctive name; in short, that the original Greeks were themselves Sacæ and worshippers of the sun god Ies-saca.

These conclusions had been anticipated by the antiquarian and philological researches of Jamieson, Pinkerton, Macfarlan, Buchanan, Pococke and others. The present work is only concerned with these views so far as they establish the antiquity of that Norse race which colonized or conquered Britain during the republican æra of Rome and introduced into the Islands those elements of political liberty to which their own freedom in the Deserts and Seas of the North had accustomed them, but whose completion, maturity and perfection they could only have found in the institutes of the Roman Commonwealth. A very brief outline of the antiquarian argument will therefore suffice.

Starting from the mountain valleys of the Upper Oxus and carrying with them the Solar worship, the Sacæ appeared in the river bottoms of the Tigris as early, perhaps, as the eighteenth century B.C. That they were driven from their Asian homes by the Brahmins of India has been suspected but not determined. In Mesopotamia they no doubt found a large indigenous population, yet destitute of certain aids to material developement, with which the Sacæ, though substantially a pastoral people, were already long familiar. Among these was the domestic horse, which it can hardly be doubted the latter introduced into both Assyria, Asia Minor, Greece and Egypt. Indeed, according

to Pococke some of the Sacæ were known distinctively as Hiyanians, or Horse-tribes, a term which in the after developement of the Greek language was softened into Ionians.

All this will sound strangely to ears long attuned to the smooth mendacity of medieval ecclesiastical history; but it rests upon a very strong foundation of philological and archæological research. The chronology may indeed require to be readjusted, but in the main these opinions are supported by valid and independent proofs. The period when the "Chiefs of the Hela," Hellaines, or Hellenes, first made their appearance in that famous country, whose priests afterwards ungratefully disowned their paternity, is uncertain; however, it appears to fall between the eighteenth and seventeenth century before our æra.¹ At a later period we find the Veneti, Eneti, Beneti, or Heneti, another tribe of Sacæ, Catti, Khatti, or Getæ, occupying the shores of the Euxine; their most important settlement being Trapesus, (Trebizond,) near which they worked the copper and iron mines of Chalybia. Here no doubt to the reader's relief they come within the purview of those classical authors whose altered works have hitherto been too largely accepted as history; and here we leave them to the care of Homer, Hecataeus, Sophocles, Euripides, Cato, Strabo, Pliny, Nepos, Mela, Arrian, Solinus and Justin. All of these authors allude to the Veneti, some identify them with the Getæ, some allude to their tall figures, blue eyes and yellow hair, some to their fighting-women, their female chieftains, their peculiar mode of travel, their love of horses, their horse-fights, horse-races and horse-sacrifices, their worship of the Sun, and many other traits and customs with which we people of the north are not altogether unfamiliar.² Others mention their conflicts with the Phœnicians concerning the navigation and trade of the Euxine, their struggles against the Assyrian hierarchy and their final defeat and removal to Greece, where a portion joined their brother Getæ in Thrace and Mœsia; while the main body settled in Illyria and began a new history on the shores of the Adriatic.

As Oriental products have been found in Europe amongst the remains of a period anterior to the seventeenth century B. C.—which is believed to be that of the first appearance of Phœnician traders in the Red and Mediterranean seas—it must be assumed that if they entered Asia Minor prior to this period the Veneti either came by sea to Babylon, or overland by the Caucasus. Upon comparing the an-

¹ Pococke, "India in Greece."

² Aswa, a horse; Aswa-medha, a horse sacrifice. This is observed in India on the winter solstice. It was observed by the Sun-worshippers twelve centuries before our æra. Col. Tod, cited in Pococke, p. 51.

cient overland trade route laid down in Ptolemy's Geography with the works of modern travellers Mr. Murray was able to demonstrate that it crossed the Pamirs and descended the Beloor by the valley of the Oxus, whence it seems to have crossed the Caspian sea.³ This was probably the route of the Veneti. The whole country north of the Oxus was known as Katt-ei or Kat-ai, and this name it retained down to the period of the Mongol conquest of China.

It has been assumed herein that the Getæ, the Sacæ and the Goths were the same people. Let us now briefly examine the evidences upon which this assumption rests. The first of these terms relates to the original habitat of these people, the second to their religion, the third to their god. Catti, Gatti, Getæ, Khatti, Khatai, Ke-ti, etc., are variants of a northern Asiatic word meaning the Desert, or people of the Desert,⁴ whose identity is fully established by Cassiodorus, Procopius, Marco-Polo, Rudbeck, Malte-Brun and other authors. Indeed the Khatai, pronounced Ke-ti, exist to this day; and they and their present country, northern Tibet, are both known by that name. When Marco-Polo traversed the old caravan route and entered China, this warlike race had conquered that empire and bestowed their name upon it, a name which the Venetian merchant afterwards brought to Europe in the corrupted form of Cathai, or Cathay. Saca, Sacæ, Saxæ, and Scythi, or Scythians, are likewise variants of one word, which in this case is taken from the name of the Solar god, Ies-saca. That the Getæ and the Sacæ were the same people is established by numerous evidences and corroborated by Buchanan, Rudbeck, Pinkerton, Jamieson, Tod, Princeps and other Orientalists. Goth is not a variant or derivative of Getæ, but is an English form of Got or Gotama, the name of the deity, worshipped by the Getæ, or Saxæ, after they had engrafted some form of Buddhism upon their original worship of the Sun.⁵ Hence the oldest of these names is Catti and as such it is often found inscribed on the Assyrian monuments. Even in the Greek literature that has been permitted to reach us, the Getæ appear as early as the fifth century B.C., for Thucydides informs us that in his time they were employed in arms against the Macedonians. From other sources we know that in the following century Philip made war upon them in Mœsia.⁶

³ Hugh Murray, Trans. Royal Soc. Edinburgh, VIII, 171; also a later work entitled "An Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels in Asia," I, 485.

⁴ Malte-Brun, Geog., II, 24.

⁵ Noël, Myth., voc., "Got."

⁶ Thucydides, Pel. War, year III, fin. The wars of Philip against the Getæ are mentioned in Q. Curtius, Supp. I, 5, 12. Tomi, Tomis, or Tomos, 36 miles from the mouth of the Danube, was the capital of Lower Mœsia and the place of Ovid's unexplained banishment by Augustus. It was inhabited or surrounded by the Getæ. Ovid learnt their language and wrote a poem in it. This work may have been the source of some of the muddled mythology of the sagas.

If we seek for the origin of those hosts who overran the Roman empire during the Dark Ages in the evidences afforded by their stature, complexion, maritime habits, and fondness for a cold climate, these point to the north and to the seaside. Pliny the Elder repeats, after Cornelius Nepos, that in the consulship of Quintus Metellus Celer and Lucius Afranius (B. C. 60) certain Indians (any Asiatic race might have been called Indians at that time) who had sailed from their own country on a trading voyage, were cast away on the northern coasts of Europe, captured by the Suevians, and by them handed over to the Roman governor of Gaul.⁷ These adventurers must have been blown around the North Cape; and their voyage indicates one of the paths by which the blue-eyed and yellow-haired Goths had previously found their way to northern Europe. By a similar path, that is, sailing always in high latitudes, the Goths afterwards found their way to Iceland, Greenland and America.

In the fourth century B.C., Pytheas of Marseilles found Gutones or Goths, established along the shores of the Baltic sea for a distance of 6000 stadia, or 750 miles. This would extend their territory from the Neva to the Rhine. He mentions their island, Abalus, which Timæus called Basilia,⁸ probably either Usedom or Wollin, and alludes to their neighbours, the Teutones, who traded with them for amber, which the latter doubtless carried into Greece.⁹ We here say nothing of the traditional antiquity of certain northern cities, nor of the numerous dome-rings, tumuli, and other ancient Gothic remains found in Britain, because they have no positive dates. Relying solely upon evidences with dates we are warranted in concluding that the Goths occupied not only the Cimmerian Bosphorus, Pontus, Thracia and Mœsia, but also the shores of the Baltic, from the Gulf of Bothnia to the Firth of Forth; in a word, that they encircled the northern and eastern frontiers of classical Europe, including Scandinavia,¹⁰ as early as the fifth century before our æra, possibly much earlier.

⁷ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, II, 67. Tacitus also says explicitly that "the first migrations" (from Asia into northern Europe) "were made by sea." *Germania*, II.

⁸ Strabo, 2, etc.; Pliny, XXXVII, II; see also IV, 27, 28.

⁹ To Pytheas, Cæsar, Strabo, Pliny and Tacitus, "Germany" meant all north-eastern Europe. This sweeping phraseology has bred a multitude of blunders. Herodotus, *Thalia*, 115, mentions the amber (*electrum*) brought to Greece from the Northern sea. A recent German writer, Herr Meyer, throws doubt upon this source of amber and thinks that previous to the first century of the Christian æra the Roman supplies all came from the Orient; but he has evidently not seen a copy of Herodotus, nor made any analysis of Baltic and Burmese amber, whose relative proportions of succinic acid would have at once resolved his doubts in favour of the explicit statement of Herodotus. London "*Chronicle*," September 23rd, 1893.

¹⁰ From Scanda-nabhi, meaning Scanda chiefs. Pococke, 53.

The religion of the Goths so far as it is known to us was much corrupted; the numerous place-names in the north which begin with Ies; the octonary division of the year; the octonary ratio of gold and silver; the sacrifices of horses; and many of their festivals, belong to the Solar worship; the worship of Bhadr, Balder, Teut, Tat, or Woden and of the Mother of God; the sacred sign of the svastica; and the absence of caste; these are Buddhic. On the other hand, the festival of the vernal equinox, the triune godship of Thor, Woden and Friga, the rite of baptism, the sacrifice of human beings, the institute of hirsars, and the code of retts, are Brahminical. The runic letters, which are peculiar to the Goths and which have been found either on bedrocks, or heavy boulders, or slabs, all the way from the banks of the Yen-Iesei river to Greenland, and except in the last named case always between latitude 50 and 60 north, point to the vicinity of that vast inland sea, Lake Baikal, as their original habitat.¹¹ Starting from this point, probably as early as the eighth century before our æra, the Baltic Goths appear to have descended to the White sea, made their way around the Cape, and reconnoitered the coast of Norway, which in the Sagas, is called Halgaland, or the Holy Land, probably in reference to the religious rest or freedom which they had hoped to derive from their removal thither. It is likely that many such voyages were made and many colonies planted in Halgaland before the main body of the more northern Getæ ventured to cross the steppes and approach their future country on horseback. Their route is indicated by the place-name of the god Ies, which, like a woodman's "blaze" through a forest, they left wherever they dwelt. This name will be found in Russia and along both shores of the Baltic sea, as far west as Britain, circumstances which render it probable that these migrations were spread over a lengthy period. Some portions of this interval may be filled up from the meagre annals of the Massagetæ, and other Desert tribes mentioned by Herodotus; but for the most part, it is blank. At the end of this time, that is to say, when Pytheas visited the Baltic, the Goths encircled northern Europe; and the same gods were worshipped and a similar dialect spoken certainly in Esthonia, North Britain and Northern France and probably at every seaport between Novgorod, Leith and the

¹¹ Rune is a Gothic word, meaning a magical letter, a mystery, a myth, and it had no more to do with runir, the Latin for spear, than it had with a catapult. The Greeks used the runic letters and avoided the Gothic language. In a similar way the Gaulish druids and Helvetians both used the Greek letters, but not the Greek language. Cæsar, VI, 13; I, 29.

mouth of the Loire, where Cæsar found a powerful colony of the Veneti.¹²

It will be remembered that the terms upon which the Goths and Romans dwelt in Britain, beginning with mutual respect and religious toleration, led to the enrollment of the former in the army, their admission to citizenship and to frequent intermarriages between the Roman soldiers and provincial Gothic women. This good understanding, though interrupted for a time by the religious exactions of the Juliani and Augustini, was restored when the impious religion declined, but not restored upon its former footing. The religious development which had occurred in Rome was totally foreign to Gothic genius, which was ever opposed to hierarchical government, no matter under what name or pretence it came. The Goths of Britain, though proud of their Roman citizenship and loyal in their adhesion to the empire, had long neglected their kinsmen, the Sacæ of the Baltic. The persecutions of the Augustines induced them to remember their relatives and renew their former intimacy. The growth of the Roman hierarchy only served to reunite the Gothic tribes and races. They no longer sought alliance with Roman families, but with each other. The marriage of Thurber, king of the "Scots" to the daughter of Froude III., of Denmark, A.D. 310-24, is an instance of this kind; it doubtless found many followers both among the nobles and citizens.¹³

During the third and fourth centuries the Goths of the Baltic organized numerous maritime expeditions which were despatched east and west to despoil the rich and now more and more detested shrines of Rome. One of these, descending the Dnieper, reinforced an ancient colony of the same race in Mœsia and Dacia which won its independence from the Roman empire.¹⁴ The centre of these operations appears to have been Iestland, or Austriki—now known as Esthonia, etc.,—and especially the port of Vinet. By the fifth century of our æra the Goths appear to have reduced to agriculture the large Scythian provinces of Gardariki and Holmgard, between which lay the growing town of Novgorod, then a trading post between the Orient and northern Europe, afterwards to become the capital of the earliest republic which followed the Roman Commonwealth.

It is now necessary to allude to the Goths within the Roman empire. Between A.D. 284 and 304 at least six colonies of Goths were

¹² Bala-deva, the god Baal, was the elder brother of Christna. Balder is a corruption. Sometimes Bhadr (Christna) and Balder are used to designate the same personage. Pococke, 299.

¹³ Durham, I, 286.

¹⁴ The ecclesiastical account of the occupation of Lower Mœsia is difficult to understand and impossible to believe.

established in Gaul under the Roman emperors, or proconsuls. Of these, three were in Normandy, at or near Beauvais, Amiens, and Cambrai, one on the Moselle near Treves, one at Troyes in Champagne, one at Langres, in the Haut Marne.¹⁵ A portion of these were the Norse-Burgundian prisoners taken either by Probus in 275, or by Maximinian Hercules in 287. All of these colonists were employed as woodcutters, shepherds, and husbandmen; and except when it was found practical or expedient to enroll them in the legions, they were denied the use of military weapons. On the other hand, they were permitted to acquire land, and retain their national religion and customs. Among the latter was their inclination always to settle near the sea, or a navigable water-course. The Roman patricians of Gaul probably exulted in the thought that these pagans, lately an object of terror to the frontiers, now peacefully cleared and cultivated their farms, drove their cattle to the neighbouring fair, kept their roads and public works in order, and enhanced by their presence the value of lands. Their passionate love of freedom, their racial detestation of an hierarchy and the rebellious designs against Roman rule which were apt to be fostered by such prejudices, were forgotten; for there appears to have been no warning of the coming storm. However, come it did. Obtaining the assistance of their relatives and friends in Scandinavia and of allied or subject tribes in Scythia, Iestia, Saxony and Denmark, the various communities of Goths combined in the fourth century, and swept, chiefly in two great torrents, one through northern Gaul, the other along the valley of the Danube. Augustine, of Hippo, has left us a highly coloured picture of the devastation which marked their path from Denmark through Holland to the sieges of Tournay, Reims, Amiens and Arras; while Procopius alludes to the revolt of Jovinus and the establishment of the Gothic kingdom of Burgundy. Long before the date assigned by the monks to the Gothic or Anglo-Saxon risings in Britain, the Goths were in the possession of the whole of northern and eastern Gaul; and Gothic standards waved from Upsala to Marseilles, from Novgorod to the Western ocean.

In the fifth century their sway extended continuously along the coasts of the northern seas, from Russia to the Irish channel. In the sixth century "Ivan Vidfami subdued the whole of Sviaveldi, (the Swedish realm); he also had Daneveldi, (Danish realm), a large part of Saxeland; the whole of Austriki realm and the fifth part of England. From his kinsmen have come the kings of Denmark and Sweden, who have

¹⁵ For the struggles of Beauvais at a subsequent period against the pretensions and exactions of the Roman hierarchy, see Guizot's *Hist. Civ.*, vol. III, Appendix.

sole power in these lands.”¹⁶ It should be observed that Ivan is here stated to have “subdued” Sweden, and that he “had,” probably meaning that he already had, all the other dominions mentioned. Indeed, a great part of them had been in possession of Norse kings for several centuries. In Ragnar Lodbrok’s saga, cc. 10-19, we are told that Ivan won his English dominions from king Ella (560-87) and that he rebuilt London. An extension of such dominions may indeed have been acquired from king Ella; but as previously shown, the acquisition of the northern portion of Britain by Norsemen had taken place centuries previously. If it be admitted with Gregory and Bede that the Franks and Anglo-Saxons spoke the same or nearly the same language, this extension of Gothic supremacy must also embrace both shores of the Channel.¹⁷

Simultaneously with the rising of the northern, occurred that of the south-eastern, Goths under Alaric. Nurtured in the camps of Rome, this chieftain had learnt the perfected art of war in the civil contest between Theodosius I., and Eugenius. After the death of the conqueror, Alaric headed that formidable revolt of Goths, who, issuing from Mœsia, soon overran Greece and spread to Italy and Spain, where they were known as Visigoths. Their watchwords were Freedom and Spoil; freedom from a hated worship of emperors and from the exhausting labour of the fields and mines, to which their fealty to the Roman government had exposed them; freedom from the conscription; freedom from exactions for the benefit of a detested hierarchy; and the spoil of the patricians. More than once were the Goths baffled by the good fortune of the helpless Honorius, or else placated by bribery of office or treasure; but such concessions could but ill appease an injured and infuriated people in arms. Yet it was possibly with some reluctance that the Gothic chieftain gave the command which devoted the Eternal City to the licentious fury of his followers. The temples and sanctuaries of the ancient mythology were spared; but all the rest, together with many valuable lives, were swept away in the whirlwind of contempt and hatred which emperor-worship and its monstrous demands had invoked.

¹⁶ *Ynglinga Saga*, c. 45-6; *Saxo Grammaticus*; *Du Chaillu*, I, 22; *Durham*, I, 288-9.

¹⁷ *Epistles*, 54; *Ecc. History*; I, I, c. 23-5.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE GOTHIC PROVINCE OF SAXONY.

Medieval Saxony described by Eginhard consisted of the southern coasts of the North and Baltic seas—This was the original habitat of the Saxons of Britain—These were all Goths and worshippers of Woden—Reconcilement of the ancient texts with this view—Cæsar—Tacitus—Ptolemy—Julian—Eutropius—Ammianus Marcellinus—Sidonius Apollinaris—Procopius—Story of the conquest of Britain as told by the monks—It is contradicted by the archæological remains and by antiquarian researches—Story of the conquest of Britain in the Sagas—It agrees with archæology and with Eginhard—Intrinsic improbabilities of the monkish story—Maritime character of the Goths—Tacitus, Strabo, Ptolemy—Germany, or Alemannia, was situated south of Saxony—The Germans knew nothing of the sea and never entered Britain.

IN embracing all the coasts of Europe under the misleading name of Germany, the Romans were followed by the early Christian writers, but what the Germans, (Hermiones, or Alemanni,) themselves called Germany was far less extensive. By them, the name was confined to the higher country south of the navigable Elbe and north of the Danube. Northward of this the land was called Saxony. It was peopled by a race differing from themselves in aspect, language and religion. This view of Germany was evidently known to Tacitus. "The Ingævones," says he, "border on the sea-coast, the Hermiones inhabit the midland country, and the Istævones occupy the remaining country." After this correct definition of Germany, he forgets all about it.¹

Pliny, Ptolemy and Procopius called the people of the Low Countries (the Ingævones of Tacitus) Goths, and Vandals, two branches of one trunk. Lesser divisions were known as the Gepidæ, Heruli, Burgundians, etc. Down to the age of the Antonines, Gothic tribes occupied all of East Prussia, Mecklenburg, Denmark, and Friesland;² and they remained in those countries, mingling their blood with that of the aborigines, and forming those mixed races, of whom the most western were known as Jutes, Angles, Saxons, Frisians, and Franks.

¹ Germania, II.² Gibbon, I, 295.

Eginhard thus alludes to and designates the Eastern tribes of Saxony: "The wild and barbarous nations which inhabit Germany between the Rhine, the Vistula, the Ocean and the Danube, speak a very similar language, but are widely different, both in manners and dress. Chief among these are the Welatabi, Sorabi, Abroditi, and Bæmanni. With these there was fighting, but the rest, who were more numerous, quietly submitted." To whom? To Charlemagne, his master, who was their enemy and persecutor. In another place he alludes to "that part of Germany between Saxony and the Danube." Thus Saxony included the sea-coast. Matthew Paris evidently alluded to a portion of this country as Gothland when he said: "They, (the Tat-ers, or Tartars,) reduced to a desert the countries of Friesland, Gotland, Poland, Bohemia, and both divisions of Hungary."³

There were two lines of pagan states between the northern seas and the country of the Alemanni, or Upper Germany. The first line was along the coasts from the Rhine to the Vistula. This was collectively called Saxony; its inhabitants were Goths, its religion Wodenism.⁴ The second line was between Saxony and Upper Germany and it consisted of the country conquered by the Eastern Franks. Upper Germany, or Germany proper, embraced the Alemanni, Thuringians, Bavarians, and some other tribes who occupied the territory near the watershed between the sources of the Rhine and the Danube, in the modern Baden, Wurtemberg and Bavaria. In another place Eginhard thus describes the Baltic sea: "There is a gulf running in from the Western ocean, stretching toward the east, its length has not been ascertained, but its breadth nowhere exceeds a hundred miles and in many places it is much narrower. Several nations dwell around this gulf, such as the Danes and Swedes. The latter, who are Northmen, occupy the northern shores and all the islands. The southern coasts are inhabited by Slavs, Histi, (Esthonians,) and other tribes, chief amongst these are the Welatabi, against whom the king (Charlemagne) was now waging war." Elsewhere, and still more explicitly, he describes the Welatabi as Slavs, and his commentator, Mr. Glaister, locates them near the Elbe.

Further on, Eginhard says: "The last war undertaken (by Charlemagne) was against those Northmen who are called Danes, who at first as pirates and afterwards with a larger (royal) fleet were ravaging

³ Chronicles, I, 339.

⁴ The statue of Irmansul, alluded to in Eginhard's Annals of the first Saxon campaign and supposed by the older commentators to have been that of Hermann, is now believed to have represented the Gothic god Woden. Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie*, I, 325, cited in Bryce, 69.

the coasts of Gaul and Germany. Their king, Godfrey, was puffed up with the delusive hope of making himself master of all Germany and persisted in regarding Frisia and Saxony as his own provinces. He had already brought the Abroditi, (a tribe of Slavs,) under his power and had made them tributary to him. He used even to boast that he would shortly appear with all his forces at Aix-la-Chapelle, where the king's court was held. Foolish as his talk was, there were some who did not altogether discredit him." Shortly afterward, (A. D. 819,) Godfrey, or Gotofrid, the pagan, was poisoned, and the war ended with the triumph of Louis le Debonnaire, Charlemagne having died in 814. This passage discloses the following facts: that the Northmen had conquered those Slavs who previously had dwelt on the southern shores of the North and Baltic seas, therefore that the dominions of the former afterwards embraced both the northern and southern shores; that the Abroditi, a Slavic tribe, had become tributary to the Northmen; that Charlemagne and Louis succeeded in driving the Northmen away; that the Northmen nevertheless regarded and claimed the coasts of Frisia and Saxony, which Eginhard calls the coast of Germany, as their own provinces, and felt so certain of re-possessioning them that they even boasted of soon taking Aix-la-Chapelle; that this boast was not so empty but that some people about Charlemagne's court deemed it practicable of realization.

In fact, the Goths made their boast good, for within twenty years of the death of Gotofrid, they actually stabled their horses in the cathedral church of Aix-la-Chapelle. As to holding the southern coasts of the Baltic, they regained possession of them and held them until the thirteenth century. The Saxony mentioned by the monks Gildas, Nennius, and Bede, as the country from which the invaders of England issued, was therefore the Saxony of Eginhard, a sea-coast province of great extent, governed and inhabited by the Goths, a seafaring people, who professed the religion of Woden and who held the Slavs in thralldom.⁵ It is necessary to hold this conclusion firmly in mind, for what with the confusion of the Greek and Roman writers, the corrupted cosmogonies of the monks, and the pretensions of the Carolingians and afterwards of the Guelfs and Ghibellines, the medieval

⁵ The appearance of Gothic physiognomies in parts of Germany, a fact that has puzzled some ethnologists and rendered them reluctant to accept any theory which removes the Germans from participation in the conquest of Britain, is easily accounted for. Says Eginhard, of Charlemagne: "He transported ten thousand men (Saxon Goths) taken from both banks of the Elbe, together with their wives and children, and distributed them here and there in very small groups throughout Gaul and Germany." Ten thousand men implies a body of 50,000 men, women, and children.

history of the country is so muddled, that it does not agree with its archæological monuments, no useful lessons can be drawn from it, and the Gothic occupation of England has been deprived of all significance.⁶

Having now gained this solid ground of vantage let us rest a moment and glance over the ancient texts. According to Tacitus, the dominant people of the northern coasts were the Suiones. These, he said, ruled the adjacent seas, ipso in oceano. They are not to be confused with the Suevians, a Slavic tribe, who braided their hair and tied it up into a knot on top of the head.⁷ Malte-Brun, himself a Goth, connects Suione with Sver and Sweden, and these with Sueria, or Siberia, the northern country. If there is anything reliable in all this, Suione meant simply a Norseman. Another verbal theory is that Suione was a corruption of Saxone. From Tacitus to Eginhard not a word is said in any author about the Suiones. Tacitus describes them as a numerous people, possessing a powerful marine. After this description they suddenly disappear from history and only pop up again in the reign of Charlemagne, whose biographer mentions the Suiones and Danes as one people—which of course they were—and enemies to the Roman religion of his master, which was true, even if, as had previously been alleged by Procopious, a portion of them were Christians of the Arian sect. It is inconceivable that the Suiones perished after Tacitus immortalized them, to reappear only when Charlemagne sighed for more religions to subdue. The term Saxone was used by Ptolemy and the universality of his work gave currency to the corruption. Whether Suione is derived from north, or whether it was corrupted from Saxone, or whether, as another monkish verbalist contends, Saxone is from Saxci, the Gothic word for an axe, we deem of little importance. History is too heavy a weight to be suspended by a word, and we place far more reliance on the appearance and habits of the people. These declare that in the fifth century the entire northern coasts of Europe had been conquered and inhabited by one race of men, and that that race was the Gothic.

The Angles of an earlier date are alluded to by Tacitus, but only to say that in common with several tribes on the coast, they especially revered the goddess Hertha, or Earth, whose grove or sanctuary was on a small island in the Northern sea. This is believed to mean the

⁶ "The name of Saxons was borne by all the nations who dwelt on the banks of the Weser and the Elbe, from Hamburg to Moravia and from Mentz to the Baltic sea. They, as well as all the north, were pagans." Voltaire's "Gen. Hist.," 1, 43.

⁷ It will be recollected that the Suevians arrested the Gothic adventurers who came by the North Cape and handed them over to the Roman authorities. The Goths of a subsequent age amply repaid this inhospitality.

island of Heligoland, whose name agrees with the ancient Gothic name of Norway, which was Halgaland, or holy-land. Hertha, whose other name was Frica, was the Mother of God, one of the divinities of the Gothic mythology. Her festival was celebrated at Easter by the sacrifice of a hog.⁸ Balder, a divinity of the Angles, was that son of Woden whose death and resurrection, after nine days, formed the subject of the earliest devotions of that tribe. (Noël.)

The Venedians of Tacitus, the Venicontes of North Britain, the Veneti who nearly captured Julius Cæsar in a naval skirmish off the coast of Brittany, and the Vends or Vendians of Vinland, so often mentioned in the Norse sagas appear to have been the same people, or a people from the same place.⁹ Cæsar credits the Vendians with a numerous fleet of oak-built galleys, some of which carried leather sails, and he notes the rare skill with which they were handled. Absorbed in the task of reading his fellow countrymen a moral lesson, by means of his treatise on Germania, Tacitus forgets to notice these sails, which the more practical Cæsar evidently observed with both eyes. As to the Venedians, their galleys must have been at sea when the informants of the Roman moralist visited their ports; for no ships are mentioned and no sea-faring people, only a band of wanderers, who lived upon the plunder of a wild country. Jornandes, c. 24, says the Veneti were Slavs. If there was any foundation for this last assertion, which is doubtful, it was that the Veneti had conquered and amalgamated with one of the coast tribes of the Baltic. It is this mixture of Gothic and Slavic blood and language, added to the sweeping use of the word Germany, which has introduced so much confusion into the study of the ancient tribes of Europe. In the saga of Magnus the Good the king says that in his absence Denmark was often attacked by the "Vendians, Courlanders, and others, from Austrvege (Iestia) and by the Saxas also." All these were undoubtedly Gothic tribes who had conquered the Baltic coasts, sometimes mingling their blood with the natives and sometimes holding them in thralldom.

After the Cimbri and Teutones were exterminated by Marius, about B.C. 100, their country (the modern Holstein, Schleswick, and Jutland) remaining entirely desolate, until it was re-peopled by Gothic tribes, whose further movement into Europe may have been accelerated by the disturbance in the Asiatic populations, occasioned by Pompey's operations between the Euxine and Caspian.¹⁰ If, from this time for-

⁸ The Greeks sacrificed a hog at the same season to Ceres. Thucydides; Ovid, *Fasti*, i, i.

⁹ See also Herodotus, *Clio*, 196, and elsewhere for allusions to the Venetians of Illyria; also Guest's "*Origines Celtæ*."

¹⁰ The Abbé Raynal, "*History of the East and West Indies*," book v.

ward, we follow the ancient authors who mention the Saxons, it will be perceived that they are alluding to these same Gothic tribes, who came out of Asia and peopled the waste that Marius had created by exterminating the Cimbrians and Teutones.

Ptolemy locates the Saxons in the Cimbric Chersonesus, now known as Denmark.¹¹ The emperor Julian couples the Franks and Saxons together as one people.¹² Eutropius states that about A.D. 287 the Franks and Saxons (classing them together) infested the coasts of Belgica and Amorea, that is to say, Brittany and Normandy: "Quod Franci et Saxones infestabant."¹³ Ammianus Marcellinus says: "The Franks and Saxons (Franci et Saxones) were ravaging the districts of Gaul."¹⁴ Sidonius Apollinaris says: "The Saxons are highly skilled in the art of navigation and familiar with the dangers of the sea."¹⁵ This could only mean a Gothic tribe. Procopius speaks of the Goths, Vandals, and Gepidæ, as in all respects one people, and he describes them as of fair complexion, with reddish or yellow hair, and tall, manly, forms. "They are governed by the same laws and customs, they were formerly of the same heathen religion and are now Christians of the Arian sect. Their language is called Gothic and they hold themselves to be one nation descended from one stock." Strabo, Tacitus and Juvenal give the same description and add blue eyes. This is a description of all the Gothic tribes, but of only a portion of the German ones.

These various statements make it evident that all the maritime and riparian tribes of northern Europe were Goths, that they were originally Sun-worshippers, then followers of Woden and afterwards Arians; and that they included the Suiones, Ingævones, Angles, Jutes, Saxons, Salic Franks, Vandals, and Gepidæ.¹⁶ The Vends were either wholly or partly Gothic, probably the former. That the Angles, Jutes, Saxons and Danes were all Goths, all maritime races, all worshippers of Woden, was the opinion of the learned Dr. Henry, who says: "Although these nations were called by different names they were all descended from the same origin, spoke the same language, and had the same national manners and customs."¹⁷ If we consult the Norse sagas we shall find a complete confirmation of this view. The Rimbegla (fourteenth century) states that in ancient times the same language was spoken in Saxony and Scandinavia. "For it is truly told that the tongue which we call Norrean came with them to the North and

¹¹ Geog., II, 2.¹² Orat., I.¹³ Brev. History, IX, 21.¹⁴ Rerum Gesturum, lib., xxvii, 8; 5.¹⁵ Lib., III, Epist. 6.¹⁶ "The Vandals and Goths were originally one great people. Plinius and Procopius agree in this opinion. They lived in distant ages and possessed different means of investigating the truth." Gibbon.¹⁷ History Brit., IV, ii, 89.

was spoken in Saxland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and part of England.¹⁸

The archæological collections in England, Norway, Denmark and Sweden, tell the same story. They contain a number of objects, such as clothing, weapons and implements, personal ornaments, horse trappings, etc., of precisely similar appearance, mostly recovered from graves, which objects are labelled in the museums of the first named country "Anglo-Saxon," and in the others "Swedish," "Norwegian," "Danish," or simply "Gothic," or "Norse." Bearing in mind the exact similarity of these objects, it is difficult to refrain from the conclusion that they belonged to people of a common race or origin; and that the terms Goths, Jutes, Angles, Saxons, Salic Franks and Northmen are convertible. This type of archæological remains is not found far beyond the shores of the Baltic and North seas, chiefly in Iestland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Friesland, Normandy and Britain; no such remains occur in interior Germany or Gaul; and the conclusion appears irresistible that they belonged to maritime tribes who were not connected with the people of the remoter portions of those countries. This marks them as Gothic. The religious symbol of the svastica and the runic signs found with many of these remains also denote their Gothic origin. The Goths wore their hair long, and parted in the middle. Clovis and Clothilde were both called "the long-haired." Indeed all the Merovingian Franks wore their hair long.¹⁹ Contrariwise, Tacitus, Seneca, Martial, and Silius Italicus all remarked that the Suevians and other tribes, whom we know from their enmity to the Goths were not of the same race, wore their hair plaited and coiled up in a knot on top of the head, like the Chinese of to-day. Ancient Saxony was a Gothic province which included all the maritime states on the southern coasts of the Baltic and North seas, and it was from various parts of this province that aid was obtained for those attacks of the Gothic insurgents in Roman Britain, which, extending over several hundred years, ended in the establishment of the heptarchical kingdoms. The insurgents were Goths and polytheists. They were not Slavs, they were not Teutones, they were not Alemanni, (Germans,) they were chiefly Anglesh-men and they called their new conquest Angleland, and so their descendants remain, and so the land is called to-day.

For the preservation of their identity the conquerors of Britain fortunately possessed a characteristic which no amount of historical confusion or monkish perversion has succeeded either in effacing or con-

¹⁸ Rimbegla, III, I.

¹⁹ Guizot, III, 67.

cealing. They were born sailors, they lived upon the sea, ipso in oceano, and when they died, they asked to be buried in it, or upon some eminence from whence it could be seen. More Gothic than anything else about them, was their maritime character and their love of ships. In these they made their homes, with these they built their tombs, and from these, in after times, they patterned their lofty cathedral arches. This maritime character marked the northern Goths at their first appearance upon the pages of history; it marked them, when, before the Christian æra, they overran the northern coasts of Europe and appeared in Britain; it marked them when afterwards they stretched across the Western ocean and reached America; and it marks their descendants who occupy both sides of that ocean to-day. Says Grotius of the maritime laws of Wisby: "*Quæ de maritimis negotiis insulæ Gothlandiæ habitatoribus placuerunt tantum in se habent tum equitates tum prudentiæ ut omnes oceani accolæ eo, non tanquam proprio, sed velut gentium, jure utantur.*"²⁰

The Sagas of the pagan Goths may have been destroyed or perverted; the marks of their race upon the developement of Britain may have been effaced or distorted; but their archæological remains and numismatic monuments survive; and these shed enough light upon their achievements and policy to prove, at least, the important part they played in the developement of English character and social life.²¹ The conquest not only of Britain but of all the Western provinces of Rome, as well as the Discovery of America in the eleventh century, was effected by the Goths, who, because they refused to yield at once to the Roman church, have been robbed of the glory of these great achievements. On the contrary, the German tribes never possessed any ships and understood nothing of navigation.

In Tacitus' account of the German tribes, A.D. 98, none of them are described as possessing any boats or ships. Neither Strabo nor Ptolemy describe any of those tribes as maritime. Afterwards, during the decline of the Roman power, the entire sea-coasts of the north fell into possession of the Goths, and during the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, they frequently sailed up the northern rivers and sacked the towns of Upper Germany, escaping to the sea with their booty. Sidonius Apollinaris, a writer of the fifth century, says: "The Saxons are well acquainted with the art of navigation and familiar with the dangers of the sea."²² Indeed, these maritime raids of the Norse-

²⁰ Prolegomena ad Procopium, p. 64; McCulloch, Geog. Dic., art. "Gotland."

²¹ Sir F. Palgrave, vol. I, chapter 3, shows that analogous Gothic customs prevailed in England, Spain, Lombardy, Saxony, etc., in short, wherever Gothic arms prevailed.

²² Liber, III, Epistola, 6.

men were continued down to the time of Charlemagne, who is said to have shed tears at his inability to pursue them on the sea and punish them.²³

On the other hand, no German fleet ever attacked these Goths, or repulsed them from their rivers or settlements. If the Germans could not defend their own homes from the Goths, how can it be believed that they successfully conducted a maritime expedition to Britain, across a sea infested by Goths? As the date of the pretended invasion of Britain by Hengist and Horsa tallies with the period of the invasion of Germany, Saxony, and Gaul by the Chinese Huns, under Attila, it is possible that the legends of Gildas and Nennius were invented, for one reason, in order to account for the presence of the Germans who fled before these fierce destroyers and gained a refuge in Britain. However this may be, it is certain that at this period the Gothic tribes were in almost undisputed possession of the open parts of Britain, their sway only being broken by the walled towns still held by the Romano-British. Consequently the Germans who entered Britain, if they entered it at all at this period, did so, not as conquerors of the Romans, but as guests of the Goths. As such, their numbers must have been comparatively small and their influence nil.

When Alfred determined to oppose the Goths upon their favourite element, it took him four years to construct the six small vessels with which he put to sea in 875. After the victory of his land forces over the Gothic host at Eddington, in 878, he built a larger fleet, but was obliged to man it with recruits from the ranks of his enemies, or with pirates, as the Goths were then called by the Christians. To these he added certain riparian Saxons and Frisians, whom he invited to come from the Continent, and all of whom were probably of Gothic origin or admixture. There was no help for it. The Goths and their Gotho-Slavic broods, were the only seamen of those times. The earliest notice of any naval progress on the part of the Germans occurs during the æra of Charlemagne, but this merely relates to a fleet of river boats, built to repel the dreaded invasions of the Northmen.²⁴ The Germans had no sea-boats, knew nothing of navigation, and dared not venture upon the sea. Contrariwise, the Goths had been seamen and hardy navigators at all times since the dawn of northern history. Says Tacitus of the Suiones: "In addition to the strength of their armies, they have a powerful naval force. The form of their ship is peculiar. Every vessel has a prow at each end and by that contrivance

²³ Chateaubriand, *Etudes Historiques*; Alvaies, *History Fr.*, p. 103.

²⁴ Eginhard's *Life of Charlemagne*, and Voltaire's *General History*, I, 55.

is always ready to make head either way." This is precisely the shape of the Norse ships which were used as mausoleums and have been exhumed in modern days at Sandefjord and other places in Scandinavia, several of which were examined by the writer during a visit to Norway.

This burial custom, more than any other, marks the maritime character of the Goths. When it was too expensive or inconvenient to bury the remains of their heroes in actual ships, as many of them were buried, they were deposited in ship-shaped tumuli erected on some head-land of the coast. The sea had been their home during life, it was the dying wish of these rovers to lie close to it even after death. The expeditions both of Eric the Red and of Columbus were undertaken by Goths: Columbus himself being one of the few adventurers in his own fleet, who was not of Gothic blood. From any point of view, this race was therefore the first to cross the Western ocean. To-day they occupy both shores of it, the Norsemen in Scandinavia, the so-called Anglo-Saxons in Britain and America, the Franks in France, and the Visigoths in Spain. Their shipping almost entirely monopolizes its commerce; so that among the twenty odd maritime flags of the world, scarcely more than one is ever to be seen on the Atlantic that is not of Gothic origin.⁹⁵

⁹⁵ Hidalgo, the Spanish term for a nobleman, (in Portuguese, Fidalgo,) is from *fijo-dal-Goda*, afterwards *hijo-dal-Goda*, "the son of a Goth." It originated during the Visigothic supremacy in Spain and was used as a term of distinction for the sons of that conquering race. The Spanish proverb that the king (however powerful) "cannot make an *hidalgo*" sufficiently confirms the origin and significance of the term. Hampson, "*Origines Patriciæ*."

CHAPTER XV.

DESTRUCTION OF THE GOTHIC POWER. .

Evangelization of Gaul and Britain—Of Saxony—Altered policy of the Church—Extermination of the Saxons—Of the Avars—The plunder sent to Rome—Papal instruments—Charles Martel—Pepin—Charlemagne—Henry the Fowler—Edward—Otto—The Teutonic Knights of St. Mary—The Gothic Hansa of the dark ages—The ruined cities of Julin, Winet, Bardewick, Luneburg, Old Novgorod, etc.—They are destroyed by order of the Medieval popes and emperors, and their inhabitants slaughtered, or else enslaved and transported—Creation of a christian Hansa in the thirteenth century—This is planted upon the ruins of the other.

THE evangelization of Gaul appears to have preceded that of Britain by more than a century. The first christian chieftain of Gaul is said to have been Clovis, whilst the first christian chieftain of Britain was Ethelbert of Kent, fully a century later. The reason for this difference in time was probably the preponderance of druidical worshippers in Gaul and of Gothic polytheists in Britain. The church of Rome, as well when it was pagan, as afterwards when it became christian, had been in the habit of making concessions to druidism; but it had not yet learnt how to conciliate the fierce worshippers of Woden and Thor. The Gauls were accustomed to hierarchical rule; the Goths refused to be forced or urged, and had to be lured into it; and, as this process was interrupted by frequent recantations on their part, the good work went on but slowly.

By the eighth century the church had conquered in Gaul, not merely, as in Britain, a number of separate chieftains, whose fealty might be lost at any time, it had utilized the ancient priests of Hesus to evangelize (as it was deemed) an entire people.¹ The druids were not difficult to conciliate. The restoration of their livings, the prospect of ecclesiastical promotion, and the retention and liberal adoption of their sacred myths, symbols, ceremonies, and festivals, such were evi-

¹ The Rev. Dr. Henry, (*Hist. Brit.*, i, i, 155,) identifies the Gaulic and Gallician god Hesus with the Hebrew N'Izzuz, "the Lord mighty in battle." The name is omitted in the Eng. trans. of Psalms, xxiv., 8, although it appears in the original Hebrew.

dently the means employed to convert these formidable enemies of christianity into tractable followers. We do not continue to set up Christmas-trees and mistletoe-boughs for nothing; they mark some of the numerous concessions which our forefathers, struggling against a world filled with low forms of religion, were obliged to make to druidism. Nor was the evangelization of Gaul itself effected in a day. Between the conversion of Clovis and the evangelization of Gaul, two centuries elapsed.

It was in the eighth century, then, that the church in Gaul ceased to concede, and by a revulsion of policy—which, though natural enough at that period, our far more elevated christianity of to-day would condemn—became aggressive. Among the instruments of this aggression were Pepin of Heristal, the grandson of Arnoul or Arnulf, bishop of Metz, in Austrasia,² and Pepin's illegitimate descendants, Charles Martel, Pepin le Bref and Charlemagne; all of whom were successively employed in the endeavour to plant the Roman gospel in Gothic Saxony and the Low Countries. Hitherto this planting had been of a persuasive character; in the eighth century, if the statues of Woden and Thor could have foreseen what was coming, they would have exuded crimson tears.

In the tragedies prepared for the entertainment of refined audiences the interludes are often filled with comic passages; in the gruesome drama of the Medieval empire all the scenes are filled with atrocious deeds. From the extermination of the Saxons to that of the Albigenses, from the extermination of the Albigenses to that of the native races of America, the medieval emperors knew but one way of extending their realms and the popes but one method of disseminating the gospel, and that was with the sword. Blood, blood, blood, was the eternal cry of Europe. The ancients, who in story-books and in fanciful paintings of the Coliseum, are represented as monsters of cruelty, were mere tyros in throat-cutting, compared with the pious monarchs of medieval Europe. The Arabs, whose apostle we feelingly depict with the Koran in one hand and a scymeter in the other, were meek lambs compared with the popes. The ancient Romans subjugated and enslaved, but did not exterminate, the aborigines of Europe; the Arabs offered the more generous alternative of tribute, or conversion; but the evangelists of the medieval age were seldom satisfied with either enslavement or tribute. Their policy was far more drastic and rarely stopped

² This Arnoul, if not indeed an altogether mythical personage, must have flourished about the middle of the sixth century. Some authorities regard Pepin Heristal as the grandson of Pepin of Lunden, or Landen, a place near the modern Brussels.

short of complete extinction.³ Let not the reader make the mistake of supposing that the motive of these avowals is to depreciate a religion which we have elsewhere proclaimed shall outlast all others; on the contrary, its object is to uphold and maintain it, by removing the frail fictions which have hitherto been relied upon for its defence, but which, it is plain enough, can be relied upon no longer, and by substituting in their place, the solid bulwark of truth.

If Charlemagne could have launched and manned a fleet of war-ships on the Baltic, the Gothic race would probably have been entirely exterminated. As he could not reach Upsala or York, he tore Bardewick to pieces, levelled Luneburg to the dust and distributed such of their inhabitants as survived the slaughter, to improve the breed of his evangelized subjects. Ten thousand families of them were sent to the remote parts of Germany and Gaul. For more than thirty years he continued this savage policy towards Gothic Saxony, slaying, burning and torturing the heathen, uprooting, destroying and scattering them to the winds; and, when sated with blood and exhausted by holy ardour, he returned to Aix-la-Chapelle, it was only to equip himself for a similar attack upon the Avars. Says Enginhard (his secretary): "How many battles were fought and how much blood was shed, is fully attested by the complete depopulation of Pannonia—even the Royal palace of the Chagan is so obliterated that no trace remains of a human habitation.⁴ In this war perished the entire nobility of the Avars, their very nationality was destroyed. All their riches and treasures, which they had long been accumulating, were carried away, nor can memory recall any war of the Franks" (which here means Germans) "in which they gained greater booty, or by which they have been more enriched. Indeed we may confess that up to this time, the Franks (Germans) appeared to be a poor nation; but so much gold and silver was found in the palace of the Chagan⁵ and such a quantity of valuable spoil was taken in the battles, as can scarcely be believed. The Franks (Germans) justly spoiled the Huns of this booty, for the Huns themselves had no right to it, it being the plunder they captured from others."

It seems difficult to believe that it was a minister of the gospel who wrote thus lightly of spoil, death and extermination; but such is nevertheless the fact. A similar degree of moral turpitude will be found displayed upon every page of medieval history. Charlemagne's motives are avowed candidly enough: "He (Charlemagne) held the

³ Compare Deut., vii, 2; a text which they never forgot.

The Magyars, worshippers of Isten, did not enter Hungary until about A.D. 887.

⁵ The title suggests that of the secular king of Japan: the shogun.

church of the blessed Peter the Apostle, at Rome, in far higher regard than any other place of sanctity and veneration" (he was crowned there) "and he enriched its treasury with a great quantity of gold, silver and gems. To the pope he made many rich presents, and nothing lay nearer his heart, during his whole reign, than that the city of Rome should attain to its ancient importance by his zeal and patronage and that the church of St. Peter should, through him, not only be in safe keeping and protection, but should also, by his wealth, be ennobled and enriched beyond all other churches."

To enrich the church, to adorn it like the pagan temples of antiquity, with gold and silver vessels and rich hangings and pictures, this was the dream, alike of the conquerors of Europe and America. After loading it with wealth during his lifetime, Charlemagne bequeathed to this church nearly half of his treasure and the administration of the remainder after death. In the same way did the conquerors of Mexico, Guatemala and Peru pave with silver bricks the roads upon which bishops were to ride and bequeath bags of golden pesos for masses to the repose of their own souls. The method of dealing with the persons and property of pagans, which Charlemagne made the instrument of inaugurating, though often compelled to be laid aside, during the long conflict between pope and emperor which followed his death, was nevertheless not forgotten; and the experience which Guelfs and Ghibellines acquired in the art of killing one another, was, in the intervals of the quarrel, turned to ampler account in their united efforts to exterminate heresy. Whenever pope and emperor sounded a temporary cessation of hostilities, then the heretical Goths, Moslems and Jews had cause to tremble.

Between 927 and 1162 the various emperors of the West, among them Henry the Fowler, Otto I., and Conrad III., and in the last named year Henry Lion, the Duke of Bavaria and Saxony, employed their leisure in despoiling and exterminating the coast-tribes of Vandals and their thralis the Slavs, and supplying their places with christians brought from other places. Those who were not killed or driven out of the country, were sold into slavery, the Slavs to the Danes, and the Vandals to the Poles and Bohemians. Such was the manner in which christianity was introduced into these countries.⁶ "Whereby," says Helmoldus, referring to this transaction, "the bishops and clergy of Saxony rejoiced much, as the churches were increased as well as the tithes."⁷ In 1109, when Henry Lion conquered the once rich isle

⁶ Anderson's History of Commerce, I, 153-159.

⁷ Chron. Slavorum, written about A.D. 1170, lib., II, chap. 89.

of Rugen, he found the pagan Goths using linen-cloth for money, a sure sign of petty trade and general poverty. Indeed the tribute of 4400 marks which he laid upon them, could not be paid.⁸

In 1080 Canute IV., king of Denmark, tried to persuade the Livonians, whom he claimed as his tributary subjects, to adopt christianity; but he did not succeed. In 1172 the Lubeckers sent some missionaries by sea to Livonia, but they failed to convert the pagans. In 1198, the Bremeners founded Riga, built a fort on the Duna, erected a chapel, and appointed Albert bishop of the country. Then they called in the Teutonic monk-knights, to whom the bishop granted one-third of the land belonging to the Livonian pagans. After having plundered and driven away the latter, the country was planted with christian colonists and thus rendered tributary to the pope.⁹ In 1160 Henry Lion captured, sacked and destroyed the Gothic city of Kessin in Mecklenburg, and out of its materials he walled and fortified the city of Rostock, until then an obscure village. The inhabitants of Kessin were slain or driven away, and their places supplied with christians planted in Rostock.¹⁰

Han or hong is a Mongolian word, meaning a clan, corporation, guild, company, or association. Hansa is its Latin form. The Gothic race appears to have brought this term into Europe in the form of han; the Huns, a Chinese race, who had been conquered by the Mongols and driven away from Tartary, brought the term into Europe in the form of hong.¹¹ In that distorted and distracting narrative of events which the church of Rome has substituted for the history of Europe, there is no mention of a pagan Hanseatic league, nor of the famous towns which belonged to it and which were plundered and destroyed by Charles Martel, Charlemagne and other christian princes, nor of the treasure which Charlemagne obtained and which his priest-ridden grandson Lothaire presented to the See of Rome, nor of the cost of this treasure in blood and tears and sweat. It will be necessary to briefly supply some of these expurgated particulars. To begin with, the numbers, riches and commerce of the Baltic Vends, Vendians or Venetians, was so great in the time of Strabo that that geographer called their sea, Sinus Venedicus, or the Venetian Gulf. The nature and extent of their commerce is more particularly mentioned by the medieval writers.

Werdenhagen and other authors assert that ages before the estab-

⁸ Helmodus, I, 39; Anderson, I, 143.

⁹ Anderson, I, 157.

¹⁰ Anderson, I, 159.

¹¹ Han is the proper name of China. (Fa-Hian, in Beal, I, xlv.) The modern companies of Hungarian militia are called honveds.

lishment of the christian hansa, there existed a number of important commercial cities on the shores of the Baltic and North seas and upon the lower banks of the rivers that empty into them, including the Volkof, Dwina, Memel, Vistula, Oder, Rhine, Elbe, Aller, Ems, Iessel, and Weser, the last named river flowing through the ancient country of the Salian Franks: that among these cities were Dantzic, (Daneswick,) Julin, Winet or Venet, Bardewick, Munster, Dortmund, Nimeguen, Tiel and Deventer; that the confederacy included such distant places as Novgorod, a Gothic settlement on the Volkof, and Cologne on the Rhine; that these cities were all connected together in a han, or confederacy; that as between themselves they practiced freedom of trade; and that they were either entirely destroyed or conquered and their inhabitants put to the sword, or banished to make room for christians, who were substituted in their places, in either the same or a similar confederacy.

Julin is described by Adam of Bremen, writing about the year 1080, as being situated on the isle of Wollin, opposite the mouth of the river Oder, on the Baltic shore of Pomerania. He calls it "the noble and renowned city of Julin, a most celebrated mart both for barbarians and Greeks," meaning, possibly, pagans and christians, and he says that the Saxons are permitted to live there "provided they do not publicly profess christianity."¹² He concludes with the remark that "although the city still remained in paganism, nevertheless in point of justice and hospitality, no people whatever are more honourable and generous. This city is filled with the merchandise of all the northern nations and abounds in everything that is curious and rare." Helmsoldus regarded it as the greatest city in Europe.¹³ Peter Heylyn gives it the name of Wollin. Meursius, in his *Historia Danica*, calls it the capital and principal town of the Vandals; and Gibbon says the Vandals were Goths.

There are various accounts of the destruction of Julin, the most probable one being that about 1130 it was sacked, depopulated and occupied by christian forces; and that some fifty years after it had thus been plundered and evangelized, it was attacked by a fleet of Goths under the command of Waldemar I., king of Denmark, who burnt it to the ground. What was left of its commerce after this event, went to Lubeck. Many of the inhabitants sought refuge in the surrounding country, and (notwithstanding their alleged evangelization)

¹² Probably the christianized Saxons sent by Canute IV.

¹³ Helmsoldus was a christian priest employed in the work of converting the pagans. The "noble city of Julin" is alluded to by Adam of Bremen, *Hist. Ecc.*, p. 19, who is cited by Gibbon, v, 564*n*.

down to the last quarter of the thirteenth century they were noted for paganism, to which it seems they had returned. The date of the destruction of Julin nearly coincides with that of the establishment of the christian hansa in the newly erected city of Lubeck, which event, Werdenhagen, antedates about forty years by assigning it to the year 1169. The hansa after having been cleansed of its pagan proprietors and members, settled upon Lubeck for its head-city, adopted a constitution similar to that which had governed the Gothic hansa, and after an interval, it elected for its protector, the Grand Master of the Knights of the Teutonic Order.

Winet or Venet, is described by Helmoldus as being situated on the island of Usedom, not far from Wollin, a circumstance that, coupled with the superlative terms used in its description, suggests the possibility of Winet and Julin having been the same town under two different names, the former Gothic, the latter christian. Winet was captured by the christians on or about 1127, in which year 22,000 of its citizens, those left from the slaughter, were baptized.

The allusions to Venet which occur in the pages of Werdenhagen, Meursius, Heylyn and Anderson, confirm the view that this famous city was also called Julin; in other words, that both names related to the same place. It appears that during or after the siege "the Swedes from the island of Gotland" carried away from it "whatever was curious in workmanship and ornaments, either in iron, brass, or marble; as also tools, instruments, or vessels of silver, copper, or tin; and amongst other things, two brazen gates of a vast weight; and that from thence sprang the splendour and wealth of the once famous city of Wisby and its stately houses, more splendid than even the palaces of Nuremburg or Cologne." (Anderson.) Not many years after the capture of Venet by the christians, the dykes that protected it from the sea were destroyed, whether accidentally or by design is not related, and the entire city was overwhelmed. According to Anderson, citing Werdenhagen, "its foundations may yet be discovered and even some of its streets, as also the ruins of many magnificent structures; and although the sea covers the greatest part of its ruins, yet that part of them which is seen, is much larger than the whole circumference of the city of Lubeck."

Bardewick (Badhr-wick) a pagan city of the first class, stood about a mile north of Luneburg, (Linonia), also a pagan city, and both of them very ancient. They were captured and sacked by Charlemagne, about the year 800 to 810.¹⁴ The inhabitants were slaughtered or driven

¹⁴ Eginhard.

forth and their places filled with christians. Charlemagne made Bardewick a bishop's see and subjected it to ecclesiastical rule. Notwithstanding its change of inhabitants, it seems to have remained a place of some importance until the destruction of Winet, possibly because a commercial intercourse was still maintained between these anciently confederated cities of the hansa. There is a charter extant of the emperor Lothaire II., dated at Bardewick, in the year 1137.

Whilst Frederick Barbarosa and the Count of Holstein were absent in the second crusade, Henry Lion, who zealously supported the papal See, captured the cities of Lubeck, Staden, Hamburg and Bardewick. In his attempt upon the last named place, the citizens are said to have defied him from the walls in so insulting a manner, that when the city was taken, he levelled it to the ground. Its trade was thereupon divided between Luneburg, Hamburg and Lubeck; and upon its site grew up an obscure hamlet by the same name. The story of the insult smells of the cloister; and as the same fate befell all the cities of the pagan hansa, whether their citizens were rude or polite, it is not necessary to believe it. The various places captured by Henry Lion were retaken from him when the emperor returned from Palestine, and were restored to the Count of Holstein. Even the hereditary dominions of Henry Lion, including Bavaria and Saxony, were bestowed upon other princes, and he himself was proscribed at the Diet of Wurtzburg, 1180. Upon this, he went to England, and there succeeded in obtaining the good offices of his father-in-law, who, interceding in his behalf with the emperor, the latter forgave him and restored him to his dominions. These now included the city of Luneburg.

The ancient city of Novgorod (Novgorod Veliki) must not be confounded with the modern city of Nijni Novgorod. Although the two were not very far apart, the former was on the Volkof, while the latter is on the Volga. The province of Novgorod appears to have enjoyed great prosperity when in the hands of the Goths of the fifth century. At this period their domains comprised the whole of the modern countries of St. Petersburg and Great Novgorod, then known as Holmgard. South and east of this lay Gardariki, which was destined to succumb to Gothic rule in the following century, when one of their kings, Ivan Vidfami, reigned at once over Northumbria, (England,) Sweden, Denmark, and the coasts of Saxony, that is to say, Hanover, Mecklenburg, Pomerania and the Baltic provinces.¹⁵ "All the people of the coast between the Rhine and Vistula spoke a very similar language."¹⁶ They included the Welatabi, Sorabi, Abroditi,

¹⁵ Ynglinga Saga, c. 45-6; Saxo-Grammaticus; Durham, 288-9. ¹⁶ Eginhard, 58.

and Bæmanus (all Slavs).¹⁷ In the seventh century a considerable trade must have existed between Novgorod, Mikliardi, (Byzantium,) and the possessions newly acquired by the Arabians in the Orient; and it seems probable that this trade was continued by the pagan Hansa under an incorporation granted or recognized by the Basileus down to the Fall of Constantinople.¹⁸ Near Novgorod a vase has been dug up containing so large a number of Arabian and Oriental coins, that if reduced to bullion they would fetch about £1000.¹⁹ It is a curious fact that the oldest date on these coins A. H. 79 (A. D. 698) tallies exactly with the oldest date on the 20,000 Moslem coins found in Gotland and elsewhere in Scandinavia. Strahlenberg says that thousands of similar coins of the same period have been exhumed in the province of Grand Permia.

Great Novgorod was a pagan city and the capital of the Goths in Russia; as such, it existed down to the eleventh century, when it suddenly disappeared, and a cathedral stood in its place. But little more is related of it; yet in the scant chronicles of its ending, we see the sack, the torch, the smoking ruins, and the despairing inhabitants, as one by one they fell beneath the swords of the Latins or were licked up by the flames lighted with their zealous hands. Nijni, or Lower Novgorod, was founded in 1222, and became one of the christian hansa towns in 1276.

If there is little to regret in the downfall of a pagan hansa and the substitution in its place of a christian one, there is much to deplore in the sanguinary methods by which these ends were gained. After the victories which the gospel had already won in Gaul and Britain, it is difficult to believe that the Gothic or Gotho-Slavic inhabitants of Saxony, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and Russia, could not have been won by milder means than robbery, rape, spoliation, slavery and the rack.

¹⁷ Eginhard, "Life of the emperor Karl the Great," London, 1877, p. 58.

¹⁸ Justinian II., A.D. 705, had the strongest reasons for being grateful to the Goths of the Cimmeric Bosphorus and of the Danube, whose combined forces had enabled him to recover Constantinople. ¹⁹ Rambaud's History of Russia, Vol. I, c. iii.

CHAPTER XVI.

GOTHIC LANGUAGE, GOVERNMENT, RELIGION.

The Gothic, a mixed language—The Codex Argenteus, a forgery—Origin of English—Gothic government—Laws—Gothic Clans—First appearance of feudalism—Castes—Jarls—Hirsars—Thralls—Later constitution—Knungs—Leudmenn—Hauldemenn—Bondr—Leysingi—Herads and fylki clans—Things, or councils—Retts—Polygamy—Harems—Pedigrees—Horse-feasts—Horse-fights—Horse sacrifices—Exposure of children—Chain-armour—Religion—Solar-worship—Buddhism—The Gothic mythology—Valhalla—Nistheim, or Hell—Yule—Human sacrifices—The temple of Upsala—Treatment of prisoners—Navigation—Fishing—Iron clads—Pirating—Tomb-rifling—Women—Marriage—Holmganga—Influence of Roman civilization and of christianity—Houses—Clothing—Destruction of Roman works and arts—Norse Antiquities—Objects found in Norse graves.

“**B**EFORE the Tyrkir and Asia-men came to the northern lands Risar and half-Risar lived there. Then the people got much mixed.”¹ The Risars alluded to are evidently the aborigines whom the Goths, Turcomans, or Asia-men,² found peopling the northern shores of Europe, and mingling with them, formed the hybrid races, one of whom is called by Tacitus the Ingævones. This mingling of blood must have occasioned a blending of languages. Similar blendings doubtless occurred in Mœsia. The loss of Ovid’s Gothic poem has assumed almost political proportions; it would double-lock the door against the theory of Indo-Germanic migrations and the pretensions of racial or national relationship which have been hung upon that theory.³ Beyond the fact that the Gothic language, as far back as we can trace it, is much mixed both with Chinese, Indian, Greek, Latin and what may be termed Ingæish, or English, words, we know little about it.

¹ Hervera Saga, c. I.

² “Formerly called Getæ, now Goths.” Photius, ninth century. See also Strabo, VII, iii; Philostorgius, II, 5, etc.

³ It is not doubted that Europe was peopled from Asia, nor that southern Europe was peopled from India, but this is quite a different thing from the Indo-Germanic theory.

Since the "discovery" of the Codex Argenteus it has been held that the Goths of Mœsia had a christian bishop named Ulfilas, who between the years A.D. 360 and 379 translated the bible into the Gothic language. Were this opinion well founded the work might afford us, if not a knowledge of the Gothic language generally as spoken at that period, at all events a view of the Gothic of Mœsia. Unfortunately there is too much reason to believe that the Codex Argenteus is essentially a monkish forgery and that it is not earlier than the ninth century.⁴

As with the Gothic language, so with Gothic government, we know little or nothing of it previous to its contact with the institutions of Rome. The allusions made by Tacitus to the social system of the Gothic tribes are far too fanciful and unsatisfactory to build upon; the works of Procopius and Jornandes are too late; and there is nothing between them. The pagan sagas, as will presently be shown, have all been altered, and little is left in them concerning the earlier centuries of our æra. The christian sagas are ages too late. What we are justified in assuming is that the Gothic tribes entered northern Europe, not later than the fifth century before our æra and at first lived in a state of almost entire freedom. They had no hierarchy, no kings (as we now understand the term), no jarls, and no private property in lands. They were migratory, pastoral and maritime tribes, who lived in tents or boats and wandered from place to place, chiefly along the shores of the Baltic or upon its rivers, hunting, fishing and plundering as they went along, returning at intervals to their head-quarters in the land of Iestia, there to share their plunder with the gods and procure sacerdotal indulgence for further raids. Before the epoch of Tacitus, probably before that of Pytheas, they had conquered and amalgamated with all the coast tribes and had entered upon the agricultural phase. The Goths had two sorts of clans, the herad and the fylki. It is not clear that they existed simultaneously, or if so whether the latter differed from the former in any other respect than magnitude. The members of both herad and fylki held land in common. When a man belonged to one herad he could not live with, nor foist himself, upon another.⁵ The affairs of each clan were managed by a chief and a council, the latter called a Hus-Thing. In after times (mentioned below) when the clans were united under a more extended realm, there was a National Thing and there is one still in Norway,

⁴ See Appendix B.

⁵ Fostbrœdra Saga (A.D. 1015-36). Something of the same sort still lingers in the Russian mir, or commune.

though the present one is no longer a council, but a legislature. The term *Hus-Thing* lives in the English word *husting*, which has an analogous meaning. The Norse legislature was probably borrowed from a Greek or Roman original, modified to suit the altered circumstances of the borrowers.⁶

After contact with the Romans the social system of the Goths underwent such rapid changes that it would be difficult to describe it accurately as of any given period of time. Their petty chieftains, each with the vision in his mind's eye of the awful and mysterious Cæsar of Rome, now strove as much to rob his Gothic compeer of political power, as the enemy, of plunder; and the result of this tendency was to create congeries of tribes, lessen the number and increase the power of the chieftains, give rise to the rank of *jarl* or superior chieftain, and lead to the establishment of private property in lands, and the more systematic pursuit of husbandry. In still further imitation of the Roman system, the Goths of this period appear to have erected more permanent places of worship and conferred additional powers and privileges upon their priests, but not to the extent of forming the combined civil, military and sacerdotal office of *hirsar*, which seems to have been a product of Roman christianity. It should, however, be stated that after a short interval of unsatisfactory experiment the places of these *hirsars* were filled by a class of *hirsars* without sacerdotal powers.

Before this period, that is to say, toward the end of the Dark Ages, the Gothic social systems, following the Roman, began to assume feudal forms. This was the result, not of mere imitation, but necessity. The Roman empire was itself a hierarchy, its entire system of government was vicarious and feudal and as the Gothic tribes of Saxony, Denmark, Britain, Burgundy and Moesia, in short, nearly all the Goths, except those of Sweden and Norway, were now vassals of the Empire, it followed of necessity that their systems of government should assume feudal forms. The earlier sagas prove that at the period last alluded to, the Gothic communities were governed by *knungs* or kings, below whom were clan-chieftains, *jarls*, or earls, below whom again were *karls* or *bondr*, who were freemen, with lands, upon which there was a charge. Below these again were the freemen without lands, among whom were warriors, boatmen, husbandsmen, and shep-

⁶ The Alemanni and other tribes of Germany had each a council called *witenagemote*. The North American Indians also had their tribal councils. One is as unlikely as the other to have given rise to a legislature; yet this absurd theory appears in all the text-books.

herds. Last of all were the thralls, or slaves, usually captives in war. These wore their hair cropped.

At a later period the arrangement of castes appears to have been as follows: First, the knungs or kungs; next the jarls, originally appointed by the kungs, though afterwards the rank became hereditary. Following these were the hirsars before described; then the leudes, leudmenn, or leudirmen, who appear to have been appointed; the haulds, or hauldermen, a higher caste of bondr, whose rank (first or last) was hereditary; next the bondr, who were the most numerous caste; the leysingi, a class of freemen; and finally the thralls. Analogues of many of these castes continued in England or Scotland during the medieval ages and some of them survived so late as the eighteenth century. The title of alderman still lingers.

Although the earlier Gothic, Saxon, and Frankish customs and laws are plainly of eastern origin, modified by contact with the Roman law, yet it is difficult to separate them into their original elements. A Statute of Frauds existed at the period of the Gulathing law, c. 58, which provides that "A fraudulent bargain shall be reckoned as no bargain." This is clearly Roman. The earlier Gulathing law, c. 131, provides for a "man-reckoning-thing," in other words, a domesday council, or an assemblage to make a cadastre. This is also a Roman institution.⁷

In the laws of the Twelve Tables of the early Romans, many offences were expiable by fines: a clearly Oriental custom. Under the Gothic laws all offences, from the slightest to the gravest, even murders, were expiable by fines or retts.⁸ Polygamy prevailed among the Goths long after christianity was introduced. The women's apartments or harems were called dyngja, or skemma, and were guarded by eunuchs.⁹ Foster-brotherhood and the occasional adoption of war captives into the family, were among the customs of this period. The Goths were not only vain of their pedigrees, but also of those of their horses.¹⁰ This is also an Oriental custom. They were fond of horse-flesh as food, a custom that they only relinquished when they accepted christianity.

⁷ The Roman name for a "man-reckoning Thing" was polypticum. Cod. Theod., Lib., XL, tit. 26, leg. 2, et., tit. 28, leg. 13. Polyptica or cadastres were taken by the Romans down to the fifth century. In the eighth century they were employed by the barbarians, but only for a short time. See Guerard's Polyptique d'Irminon.

⁸ The ancient Hindus levied fines in "rettis" or christnalas, each of about $2\frac{1}{4}$ grains of gold. This may be the origin of the word "retts." See Index to "Middle Ages Revisited" for "christnala."

⁹ Ragnar Lodbrok's Saga. The sacred couch of Buddha was called "dúng;" evidently the same word.

¹⁰ Ynlinga Saga, 35; Gretti's Saga, 29.

Herodotus, (Clio, 216,) says that the Massagetæ sacrificed horses to the sun-god. Pliny says the Massagetæ, Histi, Arimaspes and others were all Scythians and of one race.¹¹ A horse feast is mentioned in Gothic Frisia relating to the year 722.¹² The Goths also took great delight in hesta-things or gatherings of horses, for racing and horse-fights, and sometimes burned their horses, either for sacrifice, or as a display of opulence. This was done by the Norman nobles so late as the reign of Henry Plantagenet. A modern writer says that the Pueblo Indians (like the Goths) call the sun-god Thor-id-deh and celebrate the vernal equinox with races.¹³ The Massagetæ exposed their old people to death. In like manner the Goths exposed their children to death, chiefly the females. "As was the custom, they took the child out of the house, put a large stone slab over it, left a piece of pork in its mouth and went away."¹⁴ A child born with a caull "shall be laid at the church-door and the nearest kinsman shall watch it till breath is out of it."¹⁵ "If it is a girl thou shall have it exposed, but if it is a boy raise it."¹⁶ "In regard to child-exposure and the eating of horse-flesh the old laws to stand."¹⁷ "King Olaf thought that christianity was badly kept in Iceland when they told him it was allowed by the laws to eat horse-flesh and expose children, as the heathen used to do."¹⁸

The religion of the most ancient Goths was evidently a distorted form of solar worship, modified by Buddhism (without an hierarchy), and after its myths, greatly reduced in number, had been made sensible to the coarse conception of a pastoral people, by reducing them to idolatrous forms. The names of their gods are a certain indication of solar worship, but their application to the days of the septuary week does not prove that these memorials of the sun-worship came through Buddhism, because such application was only made after their acceptance of christianity. For all we know to the contrary, the Gothic sun-worship was older than Buddhism. If it was coarser, it was simpler, and amidst the many contradictions of their rude mythology one can perceive the recognition of a Creative Power, superior even to the venerated Woden, a power which they called God and symbolized by the mystic T or tau.

Prof. Max Müller, in one of his earlier works, maintained that: "in

¹¹ Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, xix, 1.

¹² Anderson's History Commerce, 1, 53. American "smoked beef" is of Dutch (Frisian) origin. It is made of horse flesh.

¹³ Mr. Charles F. Lummis, in the Cosmopolitan, xv, 146.

¹⁴ Fainbagi Ramund Saga.

¹⁵ Earlier Frostathing Law, 1, 1.

¹⁶ Grunnlang Ormstringa, 3.

¹⁷ Islendingabok, 7.

¹⁸ St. Olaf's Saga.

the Semitic languages the roots expressive of the predicate which were to serve as the proper names of any subjects, remained so distinct within the body of a word that those who used the word were unable to forget its predicate meaning, and retained in most cases a distinct consciousness of its appellative power."¹⁹ From this premiss it was argued that the Jews never forgot the true worship of God, never confused the idea of God with His name, never worshipped the shadow and forgot the substance of the Deity—as the “Aryans” did. The same may be said of the Gothic languages, the root maintains its form substantially unchanged, and as the formative syllables are always suffixed and never prefixed to it, there is little chance of overlooking or misinterpreting its meaning. But did this circumstance keep the Gots, whose very name was a continual reminder of the Creator, to the worship of the true Deity?²⁰ Not at all. On the contrary, they seem to have been as willing to lapse into idolatry as they were to surrender their racial name and exchange it for Scuite, Pict, Angle, or some other characteristic name or localism. Nations do not take their religion from the peculiarities of their languages, but from those of their intellects and passions.²¹ Whatever the Gothic conception of God at any period, it was probably not a very exalted one. Judging from the sagas, the deity of the North was passionate, violent, jealous, revengeful, vehement, and unjustly partial to his favourite children, the Goths. In place of the calm ineffable smile of the Indian Buddha, the brow of the Norse god was clothed in thunder and from his eye flashed war and destruction. The existence of his varied attributes was made sensible to the Gothic worshipper by means of stones and statues, to which were given the names of Sunna, Mona, Tyr, Woden, Thor, Frica, Sætere and others.²²

The Gothic religion inculcated martial courage, the duty of showing no mercy to the enemy, but of despoiling them and (at all events at the period when the sagas took their present form) of supporting the hirsars by means of sacrifices and voluntary offerings to the gods. The reward of the brave and faithful was Valhalla; the punishment

¹⁹ “Chips from a German workshop,” I, 356.

²⁰ The Codex Argenteus, which there is reason to believe is a product of the ninth century, has “Goths in sunus,” for “filius Dei sum.” Matthew, XXVII, 43.

²¹ “What man esteems, that to him is God,” says Mr. Baring-Gould, *Hist. of Religious Beliefs*, (I, 405.) Rather a loose sort of theology, but it seems to have fitted the Goths (as well some other peoples) remarkably well.

²² Frica was adopted by phallic worshippers as the deity of pro-creation. She was the Venus of the North. Kemble, I, 362. Another name for this goddess was Hertha, or Earth.

of the cowardly and disobedient was Nistheim. In Valhalla the heroes spent the day in martial sports, feasting upon pork, quaffing beer, and dallying with thinly clad virgins, called valkyries. Sometimes the latter visited the earth and dwelt with its heroes during life. Nistheim was the cold and joyless underworld where reigned eternal gloom; the presiding deity was Hell-a, whose abode was anguish, her table Famine, her waiters Expectation, and her bed Disease.²³ The inferno of the Romans and of christianity is evidently a product of the South, where coolness is the greatest of luxuries. It was therefore made as hot as possible. On the contrary, the Norse hell was freezing cold, fire being too cheerful an element in northern countries to form an object of terror.²⁴

Among those religious customs of the Goths which christianity successfully opposed and eradicated, were human sacrifices to the gods. "On Thorsness may still be seen the doomring (of stones) within which were broken those who were used for sacrifice and the blood-stains can still be seen on the stone."²⁵ "On Thorsness there still stands Thor's stone, on which they broke the men whom they sacrificed."²⁶ "Thorgrin Godi raised a large temple to Thor. On the altar stood a large bowl for the blood of the men given to Thor."²⁷ Among the human sacrifices were those called blodorn or blood-eagle.²⁸ The skin or flesh of the victim was cut down the whole back to the ribs from both sides of the spine, in the shape of an eagle and the lungs were drawn through the wound. "The jarl had a blodorn cut on Halfdan's back with a sword, and sacrificed him to Woden for victory."²⁹ Human sacrifices were made to propitiate the gods when praying for favourable seasons and other advantages. "King Heidrek reddened the temple-altars with the blood of king Harald and Halfdan * * * in order to improve the season."³⁰ "In a time of famine the Swedes surrounded king Olaf's house and burned him as a sacrifice for good years."³¹ During the reign of Domaldi, Sweden suffered from a great famine. After sacrificing cattle they sacrificed men and finding this ineffectual they sacrificed the king himself and reddened the altars with his blood.³² "At the burial of Sigard and Byrnild the mound was reddened with blood and human beings were burned with them on the pyre." * * * "Harald Fairhair burnt one of his own

²³ Prose Edda, 34.²⁴ Kemble, I, 344.²⁵ Eyrbyggja, c. 10, (A.D. 890-1031).²⁶ Landnama, II, c. 12.²⁷ Kjalnesinga, c. 2.²⁸ The eagle was a Brahmo-Buddhic emblem. Vishnu is often portrayed mounted on the eagle Garuda.²⁹ Flateyjarbok, I, 224, A.D. 1015-1030.³⁰ Hervara, II-12.³¹ Ynglinga, 47.³² Ynglinga, 18.

sons." ³³ "Harald * * * burnt his brother Rogueveld together with eighty leudmen in his house: this deed was much praised." ³⁴ "When Odd slew Hjalma, the beloved of Ingibjorg, he carried to her the ring which Hjalma had bequeathed to her. Upon learning of his death and at sight of the relic, Ingibjorg fell down dead. This made Odd laugh and he carried the woman's corpse and laid it in the arms of Hjalma. Then he showed the amusing sight to the king, who enjoyed it so much that he seated Odd in the high seat beside him and they did feast and make merry together." To propitiate the goddess, Hakon Jarl sacrificed his son Erling seven years old, a very promising youth. He gave the boy to his thrall Scopti Kark and Scopti put him to death, "in Hakon's usual way, as taught by him." ³⁵ When king An was sixty he sacrificed his son to Woden, hoping to live another sixty years. At the expiration of this period he sacrificed a son every ten years, until he had sacrificed nine sons. Then the people stopped him and he died. ³⁶ Much of this is probably fabulous and rather proves what the Goths believed than what they practiced.

About thirty-five miles north of Stockholm is Upsala, formerly the capital of the Goths, now an obscure cathedral town. The pagan temple, wherein, down to 1075, Thor, Woden and Frica were worshipped, was destroyed in that year by Ingo and about 1155 a christian cathedral was erected upon its ruins. In Upsala was collected the principal plunder which the Goths had obtained from various parts of the Roman empire. After the introduction of christianity, some of it found its way back to Roman owners. To celebrate a victory the altars of the old temple used to be reddened with the blood of captives. A portion of the prisoners, no matter what their rank, were sacrificed to Woden. They were slaughtered like sheep, their backs broken on sharp stones, their blood poured into bowls and their bodies afterward flung out as carrion. The jarl Hakon and his son took their food and sat down to eat. They wanted to have the prisoners beheaded that day, not at once, but leisurely. They all died heroically. The ninth one asked to be smote in the face. "This was done; he sat with his face to Thorkel (the headsman) who walked up to him and smote him on his face; he did not wince, except that his eyelids sank down, when death came over him."

Sometimes all the prisoners were slain. "Olaf fell and Athelstan slew all his prisoners. Egil fought for Athelstan and was moody after the victory, until Athelstan paid him for his services." ³⁷ This was

³³ Snorri Harald Fairhair's Saga, c. 36.

³⁴ Ibid, c. 36.

³⁵ Formanna Saga, xi, 134.

³⁶ Ynglinga, 29.

³⁷ Egil's Saga, II, 475-8.

A.D. 938, at the battle of Brunanburg, in Britain, in which country, as well as in Scandinavia, doom-rings and slabs are still to be seen which were used for human sacrifices by the Norsemen.³⁸ In another place we have shown the Norsemen's predilection for ships, his fearlessness upon the sea, his skill in navigation. He was not only a good sailor, but an indefatigable fisherman. The herring, salmon, cod, ling, seal, and whale fisheries of the Norsemen are described in the sagas and they were doubtless pursued with the same ardour and success that still distinguishes their successors.³⁹ So varied were the improvements they effected in ships that in the twelfth century they invented the iron-clad. "He has fifteen ships and a dragon covered with iron above the water. It sails through every ship."⁴⁰ "The Eclidi was strong, like a sea-going ship, and its sides were sheathed with iron."⁴¹ They also invented the marine barrier. "Iron chains were stretched across the sound to stop the enemy's ships."⁴²

When the spring ploughing was done the Norse bondr were organized by their leaders into pirating or privateering expeditions. If this pursuit failed to prove sufficiently lucrative, the bondr were led back to agriculture until they gathered in the harvest. Then they were embarked once more and were expected to live upon plunder until the winter's ice drove them into port. The leaders did not regard piracy as a crime, it was a trade; a trade, to which they were born, and which they esteemed both honourable and laudable. "The sons of Ragnar Lodbrok (Lodbrok means hairy-breeches) made warlike expeditions into many lands: England, Walland, (Gaul,) Frakkland and Lombardi."⁴³ "The sons of Ragnar, after having ravaged in England, Walland, Saxland, and all the way along the coast to Lombardi, Sweden, Denmark and Vindland, returned home."⁴⁴ "The jomsvikings went northward along the coasts plundering and ravaging wherever they landed."⁴⁵

They were not satisfied with despoiling the living, they rifled the dead; and graves were opened to rob the tenants of their jewels and arms. This is why in most of the Gothic tumuli the swords, spears and other weapons are found broken and twisted; it was to render them useless to the tomb-robber and to dissuade him from seeking further. King Olaf, a viking, who conducted a piratical expedition along the coasts of France, "got very much property" by rifling the sacrificial mounds of the Gauls.⁴⁶

³⁸ Proc., Scot. Antiq. Soc.

³⁹ Egil's Saga, 10-29.

⁴⁰ Svarfæla, c. 4.

⁴¹ Fridthjof's Saga, c. 1.

⁴² Harald Hadradi's Saga, c. 15.

⁴³ These mean the coasts of England, France, Provence and Italy. Ragnar's Son's Saga, c. 3. ⁴⁴ Flateyjarbok. ⁴⁵ Jomsviking Saga, 41-4. ⁴⁶ Formanna Saga, x, 164.

Their women were commonly the spoil of war. A battle usually ended with the enslavement of the male prisoners, the slaughter of the old women and infants and the division of the younger females among the conquerors. Several instances of this sort are mentioned in the sagas; for example, where Knut slew Thorkell, for cheating him of his choice of the virgins. After the division, the women were marched to the hero's skemma, which men were never allowed to enter. Women had no voice in their own marriages; this was wholly in the hands of their fathers or guardians. The only regard that men paid to women was to exact a price for them from other men. "This is about the rights of women. Every man has full rett (indemnity) on behalf of his wife. Three marks are due to a hauld if his wife is struck." ⁴⁷ And even rett was not always obtainable. A man was often forced to give up his wife for nothing, when another man challenged him to "holm-ganga" and vanquished him. This made the woman the prize of the victor. Many a man not deeming himself able to cope with the challenger surrendered his wife and daughter or sister to the latter without a struggle. If a woman was unfaithful, the man could take all her property. This provision was open to great abuse. When a man died the woman was sometimes burnt alive on his grave. ⁴⁸

Many of the darker features of the Gothic polity and religion were effaced in the course of time either by the superior refinement which naturally resulted from contact with Roman communities, or else at a later period through the gentle influences of christianity; whilst many other features are still discernible in the customs of the nations who have descended from them. In some parts of Sweden and Norway, when unusual sounds are heard at night, the peasants still whisper to one another, "'Tis Woden walking yonder," and when the sighing of the forest is heard, they call it, the "Hunt of Woden." ⁴⁹ When it thunders or lightens they close their houses and assemble for prayers. The Goths of Britain lived in log-cabins whose floors were the earth, whose chimneys the roof, and whose window (when they had one) was made of the after-birth membranes of cows. The men dressed in pells, or skins, which rarely left their backs, for they slept, as well as walked, in them. ⁵⁰ Many of them wore skins which had been soaked in boiling pitch and hardened. Their favourite food was the flesh of the horse, and they made their feasts merry by throwing the bones at one another's heads.

⁴⁷ Frostathing Saga, x, 37.

⁴⁸ Gylfaginning, c. 5.

⁴⁹ Tacitus mentions a forest in the Low Countries called Badhu-henna, *i. e.*, Buddha's Hunt, or Buddha's Forest. Annals, iv, 73.

⁵⁰ Ragnar Lodbrok's Saga.

Such were the men who overthrew—not the Roman hierarchy, for that overthrew itself—but Roman civilization in Britain. In the course of time many of the Roman buildings which the elements had spared, were levelled to the ground, and used as materials for ruder and smaller structures. For the Norseman's mode of life was not adapted to the spacious and artistic mansions of the Romans. These were fitted for a higher social state and a populous community, in which the sub-division of labour was greatly developed, and the presence of tradesmen, artisans, and domestic servants, could be readily commanded; circumstances which no longer existed when the post-Roman dominion of the Norseman began. The successful insurgents were none too friendly to one another; their families were almost isolated; and they lived for the most part in rude huts where everything could be made or repaired by the master and was within reach of his hands.

In like manner were the Roman arts overthrown. For the successful prosecution of these arts, security of life and property, coöperation, division of labour, a highly artificial monetary system, and many other circumstances, laws, and legal institutions, were necessary. All these disappeared with the triumph of the insurgents; the arts were abandoned, and they sank into oblivion. Even agriculture dwindled to the sowing of a scant harvest of grain, and the keeping of a few cattle, sheep, and swine. The dainty flowers which the Romans had brought from distant Persia and Arabia, faded to bloom no more, the sweet-fruited orchards with which they had planted the land, rotted away, and the very name of the vetches and greens which they had culled with so much care from the gardens of Italy and Gaul, were lost to the knowledge of men.

Yet something remained which was worth preserving, something which issued neither from the Roman government nor the Roman arts of the imperial period. This was the love of liberty, which the Norsemen, though turbulent their lives and rude their manners, never forgot. They had brought it from the desert and the sea, they had seen it flourish in the Roman commonwealth and were thus assured that it fitted as well a civilized community as their own rough tribes. They had seen it stricken down by the Hierarchy and they had raised it up and nourished it and kept it for posterity. Without their fostering care it may have been buried as deeply in Europe as it has been in India.

Many of the objects which the Norsemen plundered from the Romans in Britain and elsewhere, have recently been found in Scandi-

navia. The Nydam-bog find, consisting of a boat, skeletons, weapons, coins, etc., is ascribed to the years 250 to 300 of our æra, about the period of the Sack of London. This date is fixed by the Roman coins included in the find. Among the weapons were no less than 106 steel swords, several of them with Latin inscriptions. In the Gunnarsbaug ship, discovered 1887, in the province of Bergen, were found Roman chessmen, tinder-boxes, hand-mills, and other remains, evidently the result of plunder. Some beautiful objects of art, such as vases and bowls which indicate a Greek origin, and which the Romans may have obtained in Greece and afterwards yielded up to the victorious Norsemen, were found in the graves of the latter. Fifteen centuries had hidden both the booty and the thieves, only to reveal them at last. Plunder, destruction, and social retrogression, these were the attributes of the Gothic occupation of Britain. The earlier Norse interments, those of an æra previous to the Roman conquest of Britain, contain no such remains. The spoils of this remote period are of little antiquarian value; they are the spoils which one race of savages took from another. To inscribe the adventures of these barbarians upon the pages of history, is to clothe them with an undeserved significance. Their wars and treaties were alike destitute of interest to mankind. Their rule was one of tumult and confusion, which only assumed social and political aims when they were brought within the pale of Roman government.

CHAPTER XVII.

GOthic REMAINS FOUND IN ENGLAND.

Proofs that the earlier sagas are pagan writings altered by the medieval monks—Among these is their frequent mention of baug money, an institution which did not survive the contact of Norsemen and Romans—Progressive order of Norse moneys—Fish, vadmál and baug moneys—The baug traced from Tartary to Gotland, Saxony and Britain—Gold baugs acquired a sacerdotal character—This was probably immediately after Norse and Roman contact—Subsequent relinquishment of baug money and the adoption of coins—Proof that Julius Cæsar encountered Norse tribes in Britain, derived from his mention of baugs—This view corroborated by archæology and philology—Subsequent Norse coinage system of stycas, scats, and oras—Important historical conclusions derived from its study.

IT needs but a cursory examination of the earlier sagas to be satisfied that they have been grossly mutilated. They jumble together events hundreds of years apart; they mingle details which belong to communities as yet ignorant of Roman customs, with the affairs of communities well acquainted with them; they resurrect the Scythian forefathers of the Norsemen and set them down in the midst of medieval christian saints; they omit all mention of Rome or Roman affairs, or the Roman religion, or the causes of difference between the Norsemen and the Empire; they eschew dates, ignore the calendar, and commit the pagan festivals to oblivion. The silly explanation which has been offered to us of this disorder is that the sagas were popular songs ¹ which were repeated by word of mouth for centuries before they were committed to writing, and that this custom produced the confusion, omissions, anachronisms, and other defects which now characterize them. There might have been a time when such an explanation was sufficient, but the class of people who offer them forget that the world grows and that knowledge is cumulative. We now know that language, without a written literature to fix its terms and meanings, is too ephemeral to last for centuries, indeed that a few genera-

¹ Tacitus, *Germania*, III, mentions certain uncouth war songs, but this does not prove that they were afterwards committed to writing and elaborated into the historical and poetical sagas. He also mentions the runes, which he supposes were Greek characters.

tions mark the utmost time during which it will remain unaltered. It was reliance upon this principle that led to the distrust of Macpherson's forged "Ossian" and that compels us to regard as mutilations the Eddas produced by Sæmund Sigfusson and Snorri Sturlason.²

In the present connection the liability of unwritten language to rapid mutation proves one of two things; either that the earlier sagas are medieval fabrications in Latin, translated into the medieval Norse and retranslated into the vernacular, which is precisely the case with Macpherson's spurious "Ossian;" or else they are mutilations of early Gothic or runic originals. Their repleteness of historical materials and local colouring belonging to the earlier centuries of our æra, leads at once to the conclusion last named.³ It is this local colouring which marks the distinction between a mutilation and a forgery out of the whole cloth. Macpherson had no historical dates before him, therefore he was forced to forge his entire work. Sigfusson found plenty of history in the old written sagas, so he merely mutilated them, and, with the sobriquet of "The Learned" achieved that immortality which is ever the reward of virtue and fidelity. If any further proof, than that afforded by the nature of language itself, were needed to corroborate these views, it will be found in the allusion to runic writings by Tacitus and in the frequent mention of anachronical moneys in the sagas.

The evolution of Norse monetary systems, whether in Iestia, Saxony, Scandinavia, Frakkland, Britain, Russia, or Iceland, usually proceeded in the following manner: First, fish and vadmál (cloth) money; second, baug or ring money; third, imitations of pagan Roman coined money; fourth, Norse pagan coinage system (partly derived from the Roman system) of stycas, scats and aurars or oras; fifth, intrusion of Moslem coinage system of dinars, maravedis and dirhems; sixth, replacement of the last by christian Roman coinage system of £ s. d. This progression did not occur simultaneously in the various countries named, because the Goths used coined money in Britain before they employed fish money in Iceland; it was the usual order of progression in each country or petty kingdom by itself. From the period of their original settlement in Britain down to that of their contact with the Brigantes, the Norsemen used no coined money, indeed they had little or no commerce and lived chiefly by hunting, fishing and plundering. After each raid upon the enemy the plunder was "car-

² The Ezra of Iceland, A. D. 1056-1133 and his foster-grandson, A. D. 1178-1241.

³ Charlemagne made a collection of these sagas, but, of course, these are now "lost."

Note to Murphy's Tac. Germ., III, probably from Eginhard.

ried to the pole" and there divided. It is evident, from numerous analogous examples in the sagas, that in each case of dispute, the rival claimants fought it out at once and the survivor took the lot. This is a custom not of trading communities, but of predatory bands.

The first money of the Norsemen in Britain was probably fish, as was formerly the case in Norway ⁴ and in Iceland down to the close of the last century. Sild, hring, or herring, is still used to mean money on the Baltic coasts, and the scad or scat, (corrupted to scot,) a fish of the same genus, is still used to mean money in North Britain.⁵ There are suggestions of fish-money in the expressions "Rome-scat," "scot-free," "scot-and lot," etc. Following fish, the money of the Norsemen in Britain was vadmál, a homespun cloth, measured by the arms-length. Still later they used baugs, or ring money. It was not until after all this that they began to strike coins.

Baugs were anciently that money of Scythia, northern China and northern India, of which a reminiscence still survives in the baugle or bangle.⁶ At a remote period baug money was introduced from Scythia into Egypt. Representations of it appear upon the stone monuments of Thebes. Schliemann found baugs in the ruins of Mycenæ. They have since been found in those of Tel-el-Amarna. As for dates, Egyptian chronology has been so ruined in the various attempts made to fit it successively into the mythologies of Assyria, Greece, and Rome, that no reliance can be placed upon it. The baugs engraved at Thebes are round rings, which are represented as being placed in the scales to be weighed. No peculiarity of form and no stamp marks distinguish them in the sculptures, facts that coupled with the weighing led the author in a previous work to doubt that they were money. Since that time "dozens of rings (stamped) with the names of Khuen-Aten and his family and moulds for casting rings" have been found in Tel-el-Amarna.⁷ It will now hardly be questioned that such rings were money. We can therefore no longer doubt that they formed the principal circulating medium of Egypt during the time of the Hyksos or Scythian kings. From Egypt baug money made its way down the eastern coast of Africa, where the early Portuguese and Spanish navigators found it, the latter giving to the rings the

⁴ Frostathing Laws, xvi, 2.

⁵ According to Mr. T. Baron Russell's "Current Americanisms," (London, 1893,) "scads" is still used as a term for "current coin" in some parts of the United States.

⁶ The pinched bullet-money of Cochin also appears to be a modification of the baug.

⁷ Address of Dr. Flinders Petrie before the Oriental Congress, London, September 6th, 1892. Khuen is evidently the Tartar "Kung," or king.

name of manillas, or manacles, a name that they still bear. They were used in Darfoor, lat. 12 north, long. 26 east, so late as 1850; for Mr. Curzon saw several chests full of gold baugs from that country, at Assouan in 1854. They are still used on the West Coast, from whence the present author had one of copper, shaped like the letter C, that is to say, with the two ends of the ring left apart.⁸ Another line of baugs is traceable from Scythia to Gotland, where they are mentioned in sagas, which, although, in their present form, they belong to an æra subsequent to the employment of baugs for money, are evidently mutilated versions of more ancient texts.⁹ Egil having been paid two chests of silver as indemnity for his brother, "recites a song of praise" in which he alludes to the indemnity as "gul-baug," or gold rings, meaning money.¹⁰

The suspected mutilations of the sagas are corroborated by the known mutilations of the laws: "If a hauld wound a man, he is liable to pay six baugar to the king, each worth 12 oras. If an arborin-madr wounds a man, he has to pay 3 baugar, and a leysingi (freedman) 2, a leudrman 12, a jarl 24, a kning 48; 12 oras being in each baug, and the fine shall be paid to those to whom it is due by law. All this is valued in silver."¹¹ The text of this law proves that it assumed its present form at three different dates. The first belongs to the barbarous period, when the indemnity was fixed in Gothic baugs; the second to the Roman period, when the baugs were valued in heretical oras, or Roman sicilici; and the third to the period when the oras were valued in christian silver pennies. The original baug appears to have contained 240 grains of gold, or about the same quantity as there is in three British sovereigns of the present day. It was probably the double of the Hindu dharana.

A C-shaped figure, like that of the African baug above mentioned, is twice repeated on a stone slab from the Kivik grave, near Cimbrisham, a monument assigned by archæologists to a very remote period. Whether it represents the baug or not, cannot at present be determined,¹² but there is some reason to think it does, from the fact that gold baugs seem to have been clothed with a sacerdotal character. For example, Egil fastened a gold baug on each arm of the dead Thor-

⁸ Del Mar's History of Money, 133. Baugs or ring-money are mentioned by Pliny. Nat. History, xxiii, 1.

⁹ Baugs appear to have been used also by the tribes of the Baltic coasts, after the Goths conquered or assimilated with them; for the term was employed by the Salic Franks, and is still employed in French, to mean rings.

¹⁰ Egil Saga. The Dutch still give the name of "gulden" to certain silver coins.

¹¹ Frostathing Laws, iv, 53; Du Chaillu, I, 549.

¹² Fig. 28, in Du Chaillu, 88.

off, before he buried him.¹³ And a gold baug was paid for his bride.¹⁴ Bagi was also the Parthian name for divine or sacred. It appears on all the coins of the Arsacidæ.¹⁵ The originals of the Frostathing laws may have descended from the period before the Goths revolted from Roman control.

Specimens of Gothic baug money are still extant. Gold, silver and iron baugs will be found in the collections of Bergen, Christiania, Newcastle, York and other centres of Norse antiquities. There are Gothic gold baugs, about one inch in diameter and copper and iron baugs in the London and Paris collections. During the last century a vast quantity of small iron ring-money was exhumed in the west of Cornwall and one of these was deposited by Mr. Moyle in the Pembroke collection.¹⁶ After the æra of baugs, the Goths used coins. Says Du Chaillu: "A barbaric imitation in gold of a Roman imperial coin was found with a skeleton at Aarlesden in Odense, amt Fyen," a district and island about 86 miles from Copenhagen.¹⁷ A barbaric imitation of a Byzantine coin of the fifth century was found in Mallgard, Gotland.¹⁸ A barbaric gold coin falsely stamped with the image of Louis le Debonnaire was found in Domberg, Zealand, and is now in the Paris collection.

When, several centuries before our æra, the Celts came into contact with the Greeks, whether in Spain, Gaul or Britain, they began to strike Celtish coins in imitation of Greek originals. In like manner, after the Goths came into contact with the Romans, or rather after they had learnt to abhor their religion and despise their arms, whether in Mœsia, Saxony, Zealand, or Britain, they began to strike Gothic coins in imitation of Roman originals. Such imitations are found in the uninscribed stycas, scats and oras of early Britain; a fact which is deduced as well from the Latin name of the ora, as the general type and composition of all the pieces.

When Goth and Roman first met in Britain was when the ring money was still used by the former, a period clearly established by the following passage from the principal work ascribed to Julius Cæsar. Speaking generally of the tribes whom he encountered in Britain (B.C. 55) Cæsar says: "Utuntur aut ære, aut nummo aureo, aut annulis ferreis, ad certum pondus examinatis pro nummo." . . . "They used either bronze (money) or gold money or iron rings of a certain (determined) weight, for money." The bronze metal, Cæsar adds, was

¹³ Du Chaillu, II, 476.

¹⁴ Frostathing Laws, VI, 4; Du Chaillu, II, 16.

¹⁵ Geo. Rawlinson, "Seventh Monarchy," p. 66.

¹⁶ Walter Moyle's Works, I, 259. ¹⁷ Du Chaillu, I, 262. ¹⁸ Du Chaillu, I, 275.

-imported.¹⁹ It is evident that this ring-money was not used at the time by the Celtic or Gælic tribes of Britain, because these tribes used coined money, which as a measure of value, is more precise and convenient than baugs. The Celts also came from Gaul and Belgium, where coined money was already in use. Their productions and commerce were too varied for the employment of so rude a measure of value as baugs. Cæsar says their numbers were countless, their buildings exceedingly numerous, their wealth great in cattle and cultivated lands, and their industry diversified; including not only pasturage and agriculture, but also mining for tin and iron.²⁰ Baugs had not been used by the Celtic tribes for nearly three centuries, that is to say, not since they had learnt the superiority of coins from the Greeks. On the other hand, their use among the Norsemen at this, or perhaps even a later, period is proved by the sagas,²¹ and the conclusion that the ring-money found in Britain by Cæsar belonged to the Norse tribes in the remoter parts of the island and indicated their presence there, seems to be well sustained.²² When added to the evidences of archæology, customs and language adduced by Wright, Stillingfleet, Pinkerton, Du Chaillu, Dawkins, Evans and other writers on the subject,²³ the body of proof that the Norse settlement of Britain antedates its Roman settlement, becomes difficult to overthrow.

The Norse-British coinage system consisted of stycas, scats and oras. The styca was a small bronze coin, struck from the composition derived probably from the melting down of bronzes and containing about 70 per cent. of copper and 20 of zinc, the remainder consisting of tin, silver, lead, and a minute proportion of gold. The extant stycas are confined by numismatists to Northumbria, but a coin of similar de-

¹⁹ De Bell. Gall., v, 12. Several readings of this important passage are given in Henry's Hist. Brit., 11, 238. The reading in the text is from a MS. of the tenth century. Mr. Hawkins discovered that this passage had been materially corrupted in later copies. Hawkins, "Silver Coins," p. 8, and Ch. Knight, Hist. England, 1, 15, citing the remarks on ancient coins in *Moneta Historica, Brit.*, p. cii.

²⁰ Even after Cæsar had ravaged their lands the Belgians were able to send him supplies of corn to Gaul. De Bell. Gall., v, 19, 20.

²¹ The pagan Norse kings who ruled in Ireland used baug money until they were driven out of that country in the twelfth century. This is what Sir John Lubbock, in his article on Money, in the "Nineteenth Century," loosely called the "ring money of the ancient Celts."

²² Cæsar, v, 9 and 11, alludes to the civil wars which preceded his arrival in Britain, and which, since the Celts were all of one religion (the druidical), we may reasonably surmise were occasioned by the encroachments of the heretical Norsemen.

²³ Doom-rings and other Norse antiquities of a remote date which have been found in Britain are alluded to elsewhere.

scription and used as a divider for the scat, must have been employed in Kent and elsewhere. The scat was an electrum coin struck from the composition resulting from the melting down of gold and silver jewelry. The ora was a coin of pure or nearly pure gold. Originally containing about 30 grains of gold it fell successively to $22\frac{1}{2}$, 20, 16, and even 13 grains. The electrum scats weighed about the same as the oras. The early oras are known among modern numismatists, as gold scats. Sometimes the scats were stamped with the svastica, or with runes, a peculiarity that does not appear upon any coins issued by the southern kings of the heptarchical period. Eight stycas went to the scat, and eight scats to the oro. Owing to the composite nature of the scats, the ratio between gold and silver is indeterminable. Judging from the numerical relations between scats and oras, the ratio was intended to be 8 for 1.²⁴ The coin ora must not be confused with the weight ora, which was afterwards the eighth of the mark weight, nor must the money of account called the mark, of which more anon, be confused with the weight mark.

There is a remarkable similarity between the Gothic coinage system and that of ancient Japan. There, too, coins were made respectively of gold, electrum and bronze; the gold and electrum coins were of the same weight; and the relative value of these even-weighted coins indicated that of the metals which composed them.²⁵ On the other hand, the Norse-British systems were distinctly non-German. Styca and scat are Norse terms and were not used in Germany; mark is also a Norse term, and according to Agricola, it was employed by the Goths many centuries before it was known in Germany. The runic letters and svastica are both Gothic and pagan. The Germans did not strike gold coins. The ratio of 8 for 1 is Gothic; that of Germany followed the Roman law; and down to the thirteenth century was either 12 for 1 or else, at times, some mean between this and the Gothic

²⁴ In very remote ages, some ten or twelve centuries before our æra, the ratio in India was 5 for 1; from the eighth century to the fifth century B.C. it was $6\frac{1}{2}$ for 1 and with some local exceptions, noticed below, it appears (from Marco Polo) to have remained fixed at about $6\frac{1}{2}$ for 1 until it was (quite unnecessarily) broken down by the blundering of the Europeans in the sixteenth century. During the European middle ages the ratio in Delhi was 8 for 1; in A. D. 1340 it was 7 for 1; in 1380 it was $6\frac{1}{2}$ for 1; in 1556 it was 9 for 1. Edward Thomas, "Pathan kings of Delhi," p. 235; Prinseps, "Useful Tables;" Del Mar's Monetary Works.

²⁵ The Japanese system is fully described in the author's "Money and Civilization," chap. xx. The reader must, however, not argue too much from this resemblance. In the ruder society life of the Anglo-Saxons, exchanges were comparatively few and simple and the monetary system was of minor importance; in the refinement of modern Japanese life, it affected the foundations of equity and civil order.

ratio. Finally, the independent issues of gold and electrum coins were essentially Gothic, because the Goths, down to the eighth, ninth or tenth centuries were pagans, and refused to acknowledge the pope; whilst the Germans, from the date when their country was made a province of the empire, had invariably bowed to its ecclesiastical authority.

The so-called Anglo-Saxon coins, were not issued by any central authority, but by each Norse chieftain, independent of the others. For this reason the valuation of the coins and the metals of which they were made, probably greatly varied. More important than all, the whole number of coins was uncertain and subject to the vicissitudes of war. A successful attack upon the Romans, who down to the sixth or seventh century still held many of the walled towns of Britain, might in a single day, have doubled the entire circulation of a given kingdom; whilst a repulse, followed by Roman pursuit and reprisals, might as suddenly have reduced the circulation to a moiety.

The reader will bear in mind that the *ora* described above was the original Gothic *ora*, afterwards called the gold shilling, (gull skilling.) not what the *ora* became in later ages. As time went on it continually fell in weight; the ratio of silver to gold changed from 8 for 1 to $6\frac{1}{2}$ and $7\frac{1}{2}$ for 1, then to 10 for 1, then to 12 for 1; the number of scats, or as they were afterwards called, pennies, to the *ora*, changed from 8 to 5, then to 4, then to 20, 12, 20 and 16.²⁶ In one instance there were 15 *minutæ* to the *ora*. "*Ora, vernacula aura, Danis ore, fuit olim genus monetæ valens, xv minuta.*"²⁷ These may have been not copper coins, but silver half-pence.²⁸ It would be tedious to explain the endless combinations to which the changes in the three terms, viz., weight, ratio, and value, gave rise. Eventually the *ora* became a money of account, and as the *ora* weight was one-eighth of a mark weight, so the *ora* of account was valued at one-eighth of the mark of account, which during the Norman and Plantagenet æras, consisted of five gold maravedis, each weighing two-thirds of the Roman *solidus*. This mode of fixing the value of the *ora* gave rise to new and still more perplexing numismatic problems, all of which, however, are readily solved by the guides herein offered.

These systems of money of the Norse or so-called Anglo-Saxon chieftains of Britain, are relied upon to sustain the conclusions arrived at elsewhere in this work, with regard to the racial origin, the religion,

²⁶ Domesday Book; Ruding 1, 315. The relation of four scats to the *ora* was enacted prior to the middle of the tenth century. *Judicia Civitatis, Londoniæ*; Ruding, 1, 309.

²⁷ Dolmerus, in Du Fresne, in Fleetwood, 27.

²⁸ The *minuta* of the Netherlands was the *Ies*, or *Es*. (Budelius).

the form of government of these people, and the date of their advent in Britain. Both from the types, materials and names of the moneys, the runic letters and svastikas inscribed upon the coins, the ratio between silver and gold in the latter, and the manner in which they were issued, it is submitted that they either prove or corroborate the following results: First, that the Norsemen, or Anglo-Saxons, as they were afterwards called, settled in Britain and occupied the northern portion of it at a very early date, probably long before the landing of Julius Cæsar. Second, that these people were Goths. Third, that they were polytheists. Fourth, that they formed independent chieftainships or kingdoms in Britain. Fifth, that after an impatient interval of submission to the Roman proconsuls, an interval which must have ended with the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the Norse chieftains frequently revolted and in the fifth century became independent, and so remained, until they were brought under the yoke of the gospel.

The dryness and difficulty of these details should not discourage the reader who desires to learn the real history of Ancient Britain, for it is only by sifting and arranging those facts which were too obscure to merit destruction by the hands of the Sacred College, that the truth can be determined and rehabilitated. Were there no circumstances to dispute, were there no false history to tear down, a smooth and interesting narrative would be one of the easiest of literary compositions. But the world is wearied with historical rhetoric; it demands historical truth; for upon that alone can it rely for those lessons of experience which may serve it for a guide to future legislation and wise government.

CHAPTER XVIII.

PRETENDED BRETWEALDAS OF THE HEPTARCHY.

Imaginary emperors of Britain—The title of Bretwealda was evidently bestowed by the pope—Its emptiness proved by the Anglo-Saxon coinages—Conflicting monetary systems of the Heptarchy—Utter lack of correspondence in the heptarchical governments—Efforts made to unite the coinages and the governments—Their failure—Continuance of the heptarchical anarchy.

SIR FRANCIS PALGRAVE has laboured hard to prove that during the Heptarchy, England was an united and independent empire, governed by a bretwealda which he translates the “britain-wielder,” under whom served the six other kings of that happy commonwealth. His list of the successive bretwealdas comprises the following names:

TABLE OF THE SO-CALLED BRETWEALDAS OF ENGLAND.

Period.	Name.	Religion.	Kingdom.
477-514	Ella,	Pagan	Sussex.
560-591	Ceawlin,	Alleged christian	Wessex.
561-616	Ethelbert,	Pagan until A. D. 597	Kent.
599-624	Redwald,	Alleged christian	East Anglia.
616-633	Edwine,	Pagan; then christian	Northumbria.
635-642	Oswald,	Alleged christian	Northumbria.
642- —	Oswia, or Oswin,*	Alleged christian	Deira.
689-728	Ina,*	Papal-christian	Wessex.
801-836	Egbert,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
872-901	Alfred,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
901-925	Edward, Elder,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
925-941	Athelstan,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
941-946	Edmund I.,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
946-955	Edred,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
955-959	Eadwy, Fair,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
959-975	Edgar,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
975-978	Edward, Martyr,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
978-1016	Ethelred II.,	Papal-christian	Wessex.
1016-1017	Edmund II.	Papal-christian	Wessex.
1017-1035	Canute,	Papal-christian	Denmark & Eng.
1042-1066	Edward, Confes.	Papal-christian	England.

Mr. Freeman without going so far as Sir Francis, assents to eight bretwealdas. Two of these, indicated by asterisks, are not admitted.

by Sir Francis. The anarchical condition in which England was plunged during the entire period between the Gothic risings and the Norman conquest, when its history was filled with incessant wars, murders, and usurpations, seems to render superfluous the task of controverting this theory. But as it is supported by such high authority, it requires something more than mere denial.

In the first place, it is to be observed that there is not sufficient warrant for including the pagan king Ella among the *bretwealdas*. There is no original document, or charter, or record, or seal, or coin, or inscription, or monument, of any kind, to attest his pretended *bretwealdaship*, nothing, except the monastic chronicle of Bede, upon which suspicious foundation all this superstructure of theory is built.¹ Ella is deemed a *bretwealda* apparently merely to carry the imaginary series back to the earliest assumed Anglo-Saxon period, and to connect this with the Roman period. His name should be erased from the list. We are warranted in doing this by Ragnar Lodbrok's Saga and the *Ynlinga Saga*, both of which texts assure us that contemporaneously with Ella of Northumbria, Ivan Vidfami of Sweden reigned over a large portion of England and rebuilt London. We have another warrant in the evidence of archæology and the opinions of Dr. Scarth, Dr. Bruce, Sir Francis Palgrave and Mr. Wright, concerning the period when christianity was introduced into Britain, which was really later than the reign of Ella. When this chieftain's name is erased from the apochryphal list, which the credulous Bede accepted from the simulated archives of Rome, it will appear that all the *bretwealdas* were christians and most of them were kings of Wessex. Ecclesiastical history informs us that they were all good men; the wicked ones were such as Penda, Ethelbald, and Offa, who were pagans.

Pagans though these wicked kings were, they each in fact reigned over a wider dominion and exercised a greater authority than any other of the heptarchical kings down to their times; yet neither of them assumed, nor were they accorded the title of *bretwealda*. The latter, therefore, appears to have been a distinction reserved exclusively for the good kings; meaning those who received their pewter medals from Rome. Sir Francis notices this fact, but omits the explanation we have given of it; evidently because the latter would not harmonize with his theory. If the *bretwealda* was an actual and acknowledged over-lord, why were not Penda and Offa called *bretwealdas*? Did not the other heptarchical kings acknowledge these pagans as their over-lords and actually pay them homage and tribute? And

¹ Bede's list of *bretwealdas* includes Redwald of East Anglia, 599-624.

in such case how could the virtuous Edwine, Oswald and Oswia have been bretwealdas, who were vassals and tributaries to the wicked Penda? What king other than Offa was the bretwealda, while he was king of Mercia?

If we entertain the very natural supposition that the court of Rome, in order to bring the barbarian princes or chieftains "under the yoke of the gospel" granted some of them an empty title, which would nevertheless be recognized at Rome, and might carry some moral weight among the evangelized inhabitants of Britain, we shall come at once to the whole secret of this petty conceit and the motives of the ecclesiastics who encouraged it and bequeathed it to history. However, we shall presently have better proofs to offer concerning its true character. In other words, it will be shown that bretwealda was a title which was not acknowledged by the surrounding chieftains and exercised no power over them. It was something like the title and cocked hat which we bestow upon the African chieftains whom we desire to cajole; a beautiful thing to parade in, and to excite the envy of the weak, but never to command the respect, obedience, or vassalage, of the stronger, chieftains.

As for the argument that some of the Anglo-Saxon kings, in charters still extant, called themselves bretwealdas, this is no confirmation of the theory at all. Most of these charters are rank forgeries, utterly unworthy of credence and useless for inference. Sir Francis and Mr. Freeman both admit this; yet they insist upon drawing historical inferences from them. Even were the charters admitted to be genuine, is it a valid argument to infer a permanent theory of government for seven kingdoms, from the temporary relations of one or two or three of them, towards one another, the accidental result of war or other vicissitude; or worse yet, to derive the constitutions of states from the titles which its princes choose to give themselves? Julius Cæsar styled himself Son of God; Augustus proclaimed Julius as God the Father, and himself as God's Son; the Count of Vermadois was announced to Alexius I.—to whom he afterwards paid homage and whose feet he kissed—as the brother of the King of Kings, meaning Philip I., of France;² whilst the emperor of China of the present day terms himself (we believe) the Son of Heaven. Are civil institutions to be deduced from flights of impiety, pretension, and egotism?

Sir Francis Palgrave having discovered, as he supposed, that bretwealda was a Gothic analogue of emperor, at once seeks to carry this Gothic imperial line back to the Roman period. For this purpose, as

² Gibbon, VI, 32, *n*; Matthew Paris, A. D. 1254; Froissart, IV, 201.

before explained, he is only too glad to "annex" Ella, in order that he may select from among the Roman emperors some one suitable to the continuity of his theory. And whom, will it be imagined he settles upon? Let him speak for himself: "Accustomed to the presence of the provincial emperors, *since the glorious reign of their own Carausius*, the Britons still considered their country as an empire."³ What a perversion of facts; what a distortion of history! Carausius was a Menapian; the people over whom he reigned were either Goths, or like himself, of Gothic extraction; his government was an usurpation and a protest against Roman hierarchical government. When it ceased to be that, it fell to pieces, and the "Britons" slew him and set up Allectus in his place. Yet we are asked to believe that the same Gothic people, who in every act of their communal existence evinced their hatred of hierarchical government, deemed glorious the memory of that Carausius who had betrayed them to Rome and rejoiced in the contemplation of an imperial bondage which they detested, and to which they had invariably shown their repugnance!

The proofs which we have elsewhere put forward to refute the theory of a bretwealdadom during the Heptarchy belong to the positive science of numismatics, but they are better than ordinary numismatic proofs. They bear that higher relation to the science of numismatics which comparative philology bears to verbalism. Just as in an historical labyrinth, the grammatical structure of a language is a much safer guide than the mere similarity of letters or sounds, so is the structure of a monetary system, as compared with mere types of coins.

It has been shown that during the Heptarchy the monetary systems of the various kings were different in many essential particulars, that the Gothic and Christian coins were issued upon peculiar and entirely different and distinctive systems, that the mode of reckoning in them was different, that the arithmetical relations between the coins of each series was different, that the ratio of value between the precious metals was different; and it was shown that while this diversity lasted, there could have been no bretwealadom, no overlordship, no unity of the various provinces, no united empire or kingdom of England, in the sense pretended or supposed. This diversity of moneys and monetary laws was accompanied by a diversity of other laws. It is mentioned both by Blackstone and Palgrave that when William the Norman landed in England he found in use three distinct codes of civil law, the Mercian, the Danish and the West Saxon.⁴ At least one of these codes was essentially pagan, whilst another one was essen-

³ Palgrave, I, 563.

⁴ Blackstone, I, 65; Palgrave, 49,

tially christian. Unless it be shown that a united kingdom can be governed at once by three coördinate and diverse systems and codes of law and its industries and social relations carried on with three coördinate, diverse and confusing systems of money, the theory of the Wessexian bretwealdadom must be dismissed once for all.

To appreciate the maddening confusion which the mobilization and mingling of three monetary systems, (the Gothic, Moslem and Romano-christian,) would have wrought in England, it is only necessary to briefly summarize their prominent characteristics. The Gothic (pagan) system consisted of native coins of bronze, of gold, and of electrum, the latter of uncertain composition, and all of them of irregular weights. The coins were issued by a multitude of chieftains; they exhibit no marks of central monetary authority; the tale relations were octonary; and the ratio of silver to gold was 8 for 1. The Moslem (heretical) system consisted of native and Moslem gold and silver coins, of sterling standard and regular weights. The native Moslem coins were issued by the most ambitious and powerful of the Gothic princes, yet even these were not sufficiently powerful to prevent the circulation of foreign coins within their dominions. The tale relations of these coins were decimal, and the ratio was $6\frac{1}{2}$ for 1. The Roman (christian) system consisted of gold and silver coins, nearly fine, and of bronze coins, all of which were valued by law in moneys of account, called *£ s. d.* The silver coins were mostly the product of native mints, whilst the gold ones were supplied exclusively by the sacred mint of Byzantium. The issues of silver coins were made both by princes, bishops, and barons. The tale relations were partly decimal and partly duodenary, and the ratio was always 12 for 1.⁵

In perusing these systems the reader will bear in mind that the domains of the several heptarchical kings were often increased or diminished, as when Sussex was added to Wessex and East Anglia to Mercia, or as when, contrariwise, Oxford and Gloucestershire were taken from Wessex, and Kent and Essex from Mercia; and that whenever any of the heptarchical princes gained such advantages as appeared to promise him dominion over the whole or a great portion of England, among his first ordinances was usually one to unify the diversity of moneys. Such ordinances were issued by Egbert, Athelstan II., Alfred, Ethelstan his grandson, and others; and their failure furnishes still another proof of the continued diversity of moneys and the absence of any unital and independent government in England.

These details may seem superfluous to some readers. But the false

⁵ Del Mar's "History of Monetary Systems."

history of England which we have undertaken to expose is not to be destroyed by reference to "authorities," all of which have been created and set up by the same designing hands. So far as books go, the Sacred College of Rome had the entire making of European history in its own hands, until the invention of printing put an end to its monopoly. If we would look beneath the mendacious fabric it created we must have recourse to other evidences than books, and none of these are so important or convincing as coins; first, because coins are fabricated in large numbers and are difficult or impossible to successfully falsify; second, because it was customary to bury them for safety in subterranean hordes from whence they have been rescued in modern times; and third, because of the peculiar and significant attributes and inferences which are to be derived from the study of nummular systems.

The coins of the Heptarchy condemn the received history of England as false. The issuance of gold coins by certain princes of the Heptarchy prove that those princes were pagans, who refused to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Roman empire; for no christian prince other than the Basileus possessed or exercised the right to strike a gold coin previous to the Fall of Constantinople. It was forbidden and rendered sacrilegious by the pagan pontifical and afterwards by the christian pontifical law. The higher valuation of silver to gold which the Goths and Moslems accorded, as compared with the Romans, places the former outside the limits of the Roman imperial state. And the regnal periods stamped on the coins affix precise dates to all of these circumstances. Moreover, they prove that no such sole sovereignties existed in England as has been claimed; that though some of the heptarchical "kingdoms" were united, they were not united into a single kingdom; and that the suzerainty of Rome over England, though greatly strengthened from the time of Offa to that of Harold, was far from the attainment of that complete control for which Rome contended and upon which, had it been conceded, she was prepared to base other and greater claims.

The hypothesis of a Britain-wielder and of an early British Empire is in all probability based upon a mere verbal quibble, the common material of the historical romances which were constructed in medieval Rome. In the First Book of Cæsar's Commentaries of the Wars in Gaul we read of Liscus, chief of the Æduans, "who is styled Bergobret in the language of the country and appointed yearly, with power of life and death." Bergobret was equivalent to Burghmaster; Bretwealda was equivalent to Forester, or Chief of the Woods; one was

the chieftain of an urban, the other of a provincial, tribe. Here is the theory of the Venerable Bede brought to book; here is Sir Francis Palgrave's British imperial dynasty stripped of its Roman ecclesiastical dress and reduced to simple truth. The collapse is lamentable.

The general result of these researches is that whilst the pagan states of England were indigenous growths and acknowledged no suzerain, the christain states were the offspring of the Roman pontificate and amenable to its control. Their political relations to Rome—not as construed by national pride but as shown by contemporaneous evidences, among which is the conclusive evidence of the coinages—were those of feudal provinces, whose princes were not independent, but vassals of a distant suzerain; provinces whose laws were not final, but subject to appellate Rome; provinces of limited powers, restricted, bound, conditioned, hampered, burdened and hindered by institutes whose history had been forgotten and whose origin was unknown.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE NORMAN CONQUEST.

Fiction of an united England—The first break in the continuity of Roman power, since the evangelization of the Romano-British provinces, was effected by William I. —He betrays and defies the pope, seizes the ecclesiastical properties and unites England under one government—Retrospect and conclusion.

THE monkish fiction of an united Anglo-Saxon England, invented to hide the fact of an England kept disunited by the oppressions, impieties and intrigues of Rome, not only deceived Sir Francis Palgrave and Mr. Freeman, it has misled many other writers on the subject. Egbert, Alfred, Athelstan, and Canute, are frequently mentioned as "sole monarchs," as though they ruled a kingdom which embraced all England, as though they were each in turn the only sovereigns of that kingdom, and as though they were independent of any control. On the contrary, the numismatic monuments assure us that England continued to be divided into provinces much as it was divided under the Sacred constitution of pagan Rome; that, at the most, these princes only succeeded in uniting some of those provinces; and that they were all vassals, from whom homage and tribute were demanded, either by the Basileus and his hierarchical successors, by Charlemagne and his self-styled "imperial" successors, or by pope Hadrian and his sacerdotal successors. It is true that these demands were not always complied with. The Sacred College had subdued the reason, but not the freedom-loving instincts of the Goths; and wherever this race predominated, the feudal claims of the pontificate met with resistance.

That the Norman conquest of England was greatly facilitated by a papal attempt to bring the country more thoroughly under Roman subjection, is now, we believe, an historical fact, too commonly admitted, to need corroboration. The grants of Apulia to Robert Guiscard and of England to William of Normandy were made at about the same time, and both attest the weakness of the pontificate at this period;

for the religious fidelity of the Norman chieftains was well known to be subordinate to their love of freedom, conquest and plunder; while the concessions by pope Nicholas to Robert and by pope Alexander to William, would hardly have been made, if the kingdoms granted to them could have been brought under pontifical control without their assistance.

But although the pope's banner, under which William fought at Hastings and the pope's approbation, which attended his coronation at Westminster, both contributed to render the conquest easy, it would appear that the permanence of William's government was due to circumstances of precisely an opposite bearing. It was the wily Norman's subservience to the pope that conquered the nobles and prelates; it was his subsequent defiance of the pope that conciliated the people; for this people, like himself, was of a race that had never failed to entertain an aversion to hierarchical government.

The Norman conquest of England was not merely a change of sovereigns, nor the introduction of a new set of chieftains—which is probably all that the pontificate anticipated when it lent its approval to the project—it was a change of system from many masters to one master, from anarchy to kingship, from confusion to order, from the petty governments of Saxon and Danish princes, many of them new to the religion of Rome and easily duped by the methods which the pontificate practiced to keep communities apart, to the sovereignty of a single Norse prince who was well aware of the craft and intrigues of the papal court. Egbert and Alfred, Edward and Canute, had been kings in the limited sense that they paid homage either to the western emperor or the western pope and, in turn, received homage from some (though not all) of the petty princes of England. William emulated the policy of Charlemagne, which was to climb by the church, throw down the ladder and reign supreme; to not only govern the lords and the priesthood, but the commons as well; and to amalgamate and hammer into one the diverse laws and institutions which characterized the ancient subdivisions of the country. Among the evidences of this design are the respect which William exhibited for religion, at the same time that he plundered the monasteries: his refusal to acknowledge himself a vassal of Rome; his separation of the ecclesiastical and civil courts of law; his command to the English clergy not to absent themselves from the kingdom without his permission, nor acknowledge any pope, nor publish any instructions from Rome, nor hold any councils, nor promulgate any canons, nor pronounce any sentence of excommunication upon a noble; nor coin money

without his consent and approval. Ignoring the papal grant whose potent instrumentality had delivered England into his hands, William seized upon the principalities, manors, and benefices of the clergy, rifled their treasures, plundered their plate, infringed their privileges and invested his own followers with their lucrative livings. In the face of the papal edicts concerning investitures, he reduced the church lands to the condition of knight fees or baronies, and compelled the bishops to afford him that military service, for which every Gothic prince, since Clovis, had contended, but which, so great was yet the power of Rome, that but few of them had succeeded in securing from ecclesiastics.¹

The success of these measures was due neither to the numbers nor the valour of William's followers, but to the indifference or sympathy of the commons. The British and Roman elements of the population had faded into comparative insignificance and had been replaced with Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Danes, Norwegians, Menapians and Normans. All of these people were of kindred blood, habits, and convictions; and among these convictions remained that ineradicable hatred of sacerdotal government which characterized the Gothic tribes at the beginning of history and which characterizes their descendants to-day.² It is asking us too much to believe that William's military power was sufficient to crush the numerous rebellions of the "Anglo-Saxon" lords which distinguished his reign, unless he had been largely supported by the sympathy and aid of the inferior "Anglo-Saxon" nobility. His Norman followers were not the only nobles in England who knew the Song of Roland, nor the only ones who lifted their voices to proclaim William as king of England in Westminster Abbey. We have repeated instances throughout the dark and medieval ages, of Gothic chieftains and princes, whose military prestige and administrative ability rendered them superior to the always decaying government of Rome, and compelled it for a time to bow to their will. Alaric, Clovis, Charlemagne, Offa, William of Normandy, were all leaders of this stamp. But their institutes rarely survived their reigns. Rome, even in its decay, was so active and persistent that it successively destroyed them all. It was a contest between individuals who

¹ Military service from ecclesiastics has only been secured by the French government within the past few years.

² The necessity for those frequent interdictions of Druidical and Gothic rites and customs which appear in the canons of Edgar, Athelstan, and other sub-papal princes of this period, prove the large element of anti-papal sentiment and opinion entertained by the people of England. Spelman, Concil., I, 443-78; Henry, Hist. Britain, II, 275. It also explains the popularity of Godwin and his sons.

lived, differed, and died, and a Corporation which lived, but never faltered and could not die. Sooner or later these princes passed away, and sooner or later Rome resumed its unnatural and decrepid sway. The line of Clovis disappeared with the feeble princes whose shadowy thrones were seized by episcopal mayors of the palace; the line of Charlemagne terminated with the Saintly, the Bald, the Stammering, and the Simple, mere puppets of Roman intrigue; Offa and his laws were both buried in a Roman monastery; and William's institutes expired in the Roman vassalage of Stephen and John.

Despite the brave words in which William's reply was conveyed to pope Gregory, there are many evidence to indicate that the Norman did not intend to wholly disavow the suzerainty of the empire. He never infringed the prerogatives that still remained in the hands of the pope's ancient suzerain, the Sacred emperor of Constantinople; he created no nobles of the rank of prince or duke; he chartered no corporations; he convened no national senate or parliament; he entered into no treaties with foreign nations; he abstained from foreign wars; he neither sent nor received foreign ambassadors; he maintained neither standing army nor fleet; he claimed no mines royal; he struck no gold coins; he made no alteration in the Roman valuation of gold and silver money. These were prerogatives of sovereignty, which, from the moment that the monarchs of England became undeniably independent, were all exercised with un mistakeable vigour; yet the Norman conqueror did not venture to indulge in one of them.³

His attitude was a waiting one, and it remained a waiting one so long as he lived. If the pontificate under Alexander was weak, the empire under the infant Henry IV., and the regent Agnes, was weaker; and as the attitude attributed to William was not assumed until after that deadly struggle between western pope and emperor had broken out, which deprived both these powers of the means to enforce their claims of suzerainty, it would seem that William, too conscious of his inability to hold England against the wishes of the winner in this con-

³ The coinage of gold was a proclamation of absolute sovereignty, a prerogative of the Cæsars, which descended to the Basileus, and was never attempted to be exercised by any christian prince until he was prepared to assert his independence of the Empire. This subject is treated at length in the author's other works. The mancusses of Offa were pagan coins. The first christian gold coins of England (barring one or two doubtful pieces weakly attributed to certain "bishops" of the heptarchical period) were struck by Henry III. in 1257, that is to say, half a century later than the Fall of Constantinople and the Basileus. The earliest instance of a claim by the British crown to mines royal is to be found in the 47th year of Henry III., 1262.

test, prudently awaited its issue, before assuming an entirely independent position.⁴

In seeking to determine the precise status of medieval kings and kingdoms it must be borne in mind that the chronicles of this period were written by ecclesiastics, subject to the power and authority of the Roman Sacred College. Among the principles which governed the policy of this corporation none was more essential to its perpetuity than the suppression of every vestige of the ancient Commonwealth, because that government had taught to the world the lesson that a priesthood could be maintained without benefices and that the civil power was superior to the ecclesiastical. Hence the destruction of nearly all the literature relating to this æra of freedom, and the efforts of Gregory and other medieval pontiffs to suppress what little remained of it in the emasculated pages of Livy. On the other hand, the Sacred College found it necessary to preserve many literary remains of the Augustan empire, for in these only were to be found the origin of its own claims and prerogatives, its title to power, wealth, tithes, privileges, immunities and the assumption of universal dominion. Hence its three-fold recension of the law, and parade of those literary fragments, which, having spared and disfigured, it embalmed for the edification of mankind.

But the perversion of Roman history was not the only literary occupation of the College: it had to deal with the Eddas and Sagas of the Norsemen. By devoting the whole of Saxony to the devouring sword of Charlemagne and the cities of the Gothic Hansa to the flames, it so weakened the power of the Norse kings that they were fain to admit those emissaries of Rome, whom in prouder days they had uniformly forbidden their dominions. The usual results followed. In the course of a single century the entire mass of Norse literature disappeared from Scandinavia; but as many of the chieftains eluded the arts of evangelization and escaped to Iceland, where they set up a republic of their own, it was not until that remote country was subdued, an event deferred until the eleventh century, that the Roman government drew near the full attainment of its sinister objects. There was but one more literature in the way: that of the Eastern (Roman) em-

⁴ William's refusal to pay Peter's pence and homage, occurred in 1075; in 1080 Gregory wrote him: "Bethink thee whether I must not very diligently provide for thy salvation and whether for thine own safety thou oughtest not without delay to obey me so that thou mayest possess the land of the living." In excommunicating Henry IV. the same pontiff claimed the right to "give and take away empires, kingdoms, principdoms, marquisates, duchies, countships and the possessions of all men." Migné, CXLVII, p. 568; Bryce, 160-1.

pire. Much of this had already been destroyed or perverted by the Byzantines. Yet enough of it remained to baulk for awhile the ever rising ambition of the popes. For example, the duplicate of the Treaty made in A. D. 803 at Seltz, between Nicephorus and Charlemagne, which defined the boundaries of the eastern and western empires and reconciled the conflicting claims of these rival monarchies, would have been an awkward document in the hands of a prince like Frederick II. Happily for the papacy it was "lost" in the conflagration and sack of Constantinople.

Having in this event witnessed the disappearance or annihilation of the last scrap of parchment that could invalidate its claims to supreme and universal dominion, to immunities, privileges, benefits and advantages of every kind, it next proceeded to construct those chronicles of the various kingdoms or provinces of the empire, which it had already begun, but which the events of this period compelled it to revise.

Here is where this vast design broke down. It is not within the power of man to fabricate an imposture that shall square with the centuries. *Time will only tally with the truth.* Rome has not been able to pursue its plan with the unity of design essential to success. Its apocryphal chronicles were penned in different ages; and although frequently remoulded to conform with altered circumstances, they failed to harmonize with one another and were contradicted by those fragments of the mutilated literatures which had been permitted to survive and which the art of printing now fixed and placed in the hands of the public. The Sacred College was literally hoisted with its own petard. The unwilling discoveries of Father Platina in the fifteenth, were followed by those of Father Pelligrini in the sixteenth, and Father Hardouin in the seventeenth century. The house of cards began to tumble; and when that school of modern criticism arose which owes not its origin but its immunity to the Reformation, the Roman system sustained a fatal perturbation. The fabulous genealogies of the Norse kings, which lend a cunning air of vraisemblance to the monkish chronicles of Britain, and which in the course of a few generations deduce all those kings from Woden, failed to agree with the discovery that Woden was only another name for Buddha, and that Buddha was the god of a remote antiquity. The idle tale of Hengist and Horsa was belied by the numerous evidences which the earth yielded up of a Norse occupation of Britain long anterior to the fifth century. The chronology invented by the monks was controverted by the recovery of coins stamped with the names of kings whose ex-

istence they had suppressed and whose reigns they had blotted out from history. The *bretwealdas* when they ostentatiously paraded in the front rank of their array of heroes, proved to be mere puppets, whose ghostly titles, awarded in Rome, procured them neither power nor authority with their compeers. And in spite of all their efforts to efface from British history the operations of the Norse Hansa and the influence of the Moslem traders, enough evidence has remained to restore them both to the records from which they were torn.

But strangest of all the evidences discovered by archæology and criticism are those by which the sinister government of Rome has been detected lurking behind the thrones of the Middle Ages, and especially those whose occupants, a doting pride of local nationality, has hitherto recognized as "sole monarchs." Who could have foreseen that in the rude mintages of the Anglo-Saxon, Danish, and Norman princes, were securely locked up such proofs of hierarchical suzerainty over Britain that not the revival of all the false mints of Padua could now efface them? Yet such is the fact. The composition and payment of Peter's pence, the abstention from coining gold, the peculiar ratio between the precious metals, and many other circumstances in this connection, prove the case beyond successful denial.

There is another monument of the past which though less palpable is more convincing than coins; and this too the pontificate has failed to destroy. Whether the Norsemen derived it, as they did many of their institutes from the Greek and Roman commonwealths, or treasured it among the mysterious relics of a remoter æra of freedom, or caught it from the fresh air of the Scythian steppes, or the gales of the Atlantic, we know not; but they preserved in their hearts a dread and hatred of hierarchical government which no amount of evangelization could destroy. This feeling, which relates solely to *government* and is wholly unmixed with aversion for Catholicism or any other form of christianity as a *religion*, is interwoven not only with their institutes, it is embalmed in their dialects; and is as unsubdued to-day as it was when a Roman keel first cleft the waters of the Baltic. Long after the arms of the Cæsars had ceased to be formidable, their hierarchical government contrived to rule the world and more than once, after it seemed to be overthrown, it revived and ruled again. Nor has its hopes of a further revival so absolutely died away that the Norse races can afford to dispense with a single token of the past which may serve to invoke their ancient instincts of freedom, or unite them in resistance to the insidious encroachments of this dreadful power.

CHAPTER XX.

CONCLUSION.

WHAT has been proved? That the entire history of Ancient Britain and Early England has been mutilated and corrupted, to make good the monstrous claims of the Sacred College to both its temporal and spiritual suzerainty. God gave the dominion of the earth to Christ, Christ to Peter, Peter to the Popes, and the Popes to the Emperors. Among the provinces of the Empire was Germany, which ever remained faithful to its sovereign. When the barbarians overthrew the Roman power in Britain, it was reconquered by Teutonic tribes from Germany, who were vassals of the "empire;" hence Britain was reclaimed for the "empire" and belonged to it.¹ Such was the theory and the claim of the Church. The claim has been abandoned, but the theory remains, and so also does the false history upon which it was erected. If this history is allowed to stand, the theory must be accepted and the claim only remains in abeyance. The Protestant Reformation did not attempt to undermine this logic, because at that period the archæological evidences had not been discovered which alone could subvert the history, or controvert the theory. The Reformation was merely a protest against certain claims of the Church; and although in the course of its developement it has gone much further and practically refused all the claims of the Church, yet it has strangely overlooked the importance of examining and refuting the imposture upon which those claims were based.

¹ "The Pope, who still (A.D. 1255) acted as Superior Lord of England, had contributed very much by the great authority he possessed and the terror of his spiritual thunders, to support Henry in all his illegal exactions and to prevent the discontented barons from proceeding to extremities. But His Holiness about this time led *his royal vassal of England* into an affair which involved him in great expense and trouble by making him an offer of the crown of Sicily for his second son, prince Edmond. The Pope pretended to dispose of that crown both as Emperor, Lord of Sicily and as *Vicar of Jesus Christ, to whom all the kingdoms of the earth belonged*. * * * Henry accepted the offer; and his son was styled King of Sicily." Henry's Hist. Brit., vii, 22.

The time has come for such an examination. The Church remains, (I do not here allude to the Catholic religion, for which I have the greatest respect, but to the Roman Pontificate, which is quite a different thing,) the history remains, the theory remains, the claim remains; and there are not wanting signs that, in one way or another, furtively or openly, attempts will be made to prosecute it to a successful conclusion.

What has been proved? That the British Islands were not conquered by German vassals of the empire in the fifth century, but by Norse freemen before the first century, that is to say, before either German or Roman sat foot in them; that the "Anglo-Saxon conquest" of the fifth century is purely imaginary; and that those British institutes which are of Roman origin, were derived not from the Empire, whether pagan or christian, but from the earlier Commonwealth.

The race that conquered Britain never knew what it was to have a master; they came from the Desert and the Sea; whose gales were not burdened with the sighs of Roman vassalage; they never bent the knee to Pontifical Rome; they never acknowledged the suzerainty of the Church; and they promptly rebelled, whenever attempts were made to force upon them either the worship or the spiritual dominion of Cæsar.

Their enmities and affiliations prove their attitude. They refused to worship Claudius; they rebelled against Gratian; they sat up a republic in Novgorod; they opposed Charlemagne; their trade was confined to the Baltic and the Orient, to Moslem Spain and to other heretical states; and when at length they were duped and overcome by the wiles and intrigues of the pontificate, they removed to Iceland and there established another republic. The whole history of this people, from first to last, is filled with bitter hatred of hierarchical government. This is not an "Aryan" sentiment, nor a "Teutonic," nor a "German" one; it is purely and distinctively Gothic. It is not the prejudice of a people who accepted the Roman government, who anointed their sacred sovereigns, and still affectionately term their king, a kaiser; it was the prejudice of tribes long accustomed to liberty and whose knungs were merely military chieftains, many of whom were sacrificed to popular superstition or resentment.

The ever increasing problems of modern society demand for their solution the advantages of actual experience; the experience of legislation, of administration, of execution; and we cannot afford to omit from this experience the valuable lessons which were garnered by the

Roman Commonwealth and preserved by the Gothic states of the Medieval Ages. If we ascend beyond the Norman dynasty, where shall we find such experience? Shall we seek for it in the false chronicles of the monks, in the corrupted texts which have been transmitted to us from antiquity, or in the traditions and legends of the Sacred College? It must never be forgotten that the written records of the past were for twelve centuries in the keeping of men who saw in them only the instruments of their own elevation and who never hesitated to mould them to their ambitious theory of government. These records must therefore be rewritten; and although the paucity of materials may render incomplete or unsatisfactory all present efforts to restore the entire truth, the dignity of the subject and value of the achievement will doubtless stimulate others and still others to the task, until it is successfully and completely accomplished.



APPENDIX A.

ORIGIN OF THE BRITISH TRIBES.

IN A. U. 776 the Cheruskans, a coast tribe who were settled between the Elbe and Weser, the Semnones, another coast tribe, a branch of the Suevi, settled between the Elbe and the Oder, and, the Longobards, (all these were Gothic or Semi-Gothic tribes,) terminated their alliance with the Germans under Maroboduus and made war upon the said Germans, whom they defeated and drove into the Hercynian forest. "The name of king was detested by the Suevians" and "Arminius was the champion of liberty" explains Tacitus, but the explanation is insufficient. Maroboduus, upon his defeat, sent to Rome, his suzerain power, for succour, whereupon Tiberius sent his son Drusus with an armed force into Illyria (the country of the Veneti), "to secure the frontiers (of Rome) from the incursions of the enemy." What enemy? As the Germans were at that time the "allies," or vassals, of Rome, there can be but one answer to this question. The enemy was the race to which both Suevians and Veneti belonged, the Sacæ or Goths of the Euxine and Baltic, the "Gothones" of Tacitus, to whom Catualda fled for refuge from the tyranny of Maroboduus and who having defeated the latter compelled him to fly to Rome, where he ended his days in obscurity. Tacitus, *Ann.*, I, 46, 62; *Germania*, 42.

The immediate followers of Maroboduus were called Marcomanni, whom Gibbon I, 315, calls "a Suevic tribe, which was often confounded with the Alemanni (Germans) in their wars and conquests." When the emperor Marcus Antoninus defeated the Germans he found the Marcomanni still in their service and shipped them off to Britain. Dion Cassius, 71-2. The emperor Gallienus married a daughter of this race named Pipa.

In the first century of our æra the Angrivarians were driven to Britain. Tacitus, *Ann.*, II, 24. In the second century Ptolemy places the Chauci, a Saxon tribe, in the southeast of Ireland. *Geog.*, II, 2. In

the third century Carausius, a Menapian, brought many of his countrymen into Britain. Kemble's *Saxons in England*, ed. 1876, I, 12. The "Saxon Shore" extended from Portsmouth to Wells in Norfolk. This "*Littus Saxonicum per Britannius* was unquestionably that district in which members of the Saxon confederacy were settled." Kemble, I, 14. It is mentioned in the *Notitia Imperii*, a document that dates from A.D. 390 to 400, but which must have been compiled much earlier. Kemble, I, 10, 13 note.

All these allusions to the presence of Goths and Saxons in Britain are from Roman writings previous to the alleged invasion of the fifth century, in respect of which Kemble furnishes the following remarks: "Bede's narrative is apochryphal. . . I do not think it at all probable that this (the fifth century) was the earliest period at which the Germans (meaning the Saxons) formed settlements in England. . . There seems to be every probability that . . . Saxons and Angles had colonized the eastern shore of England long before the time generally assigned for their advent. . . The received account of our (Anglo-Saxon) migration, our subsequent fortunes and ultimate settlement are devoid of historical truth in every detail. The tale of Hengist and Horsa conquering England with three ships is found in the Gothic legend of the three shiploads of Goths and Gepidæ who landed at the mouths of the Vistula; the murder of the British chieftains by Hengist is told by Widnkind of the Saxons in Thuringia; while the story of measuring the conquered land with an oxhide cut into thongs is found in the myths of many nations."

Lappenberg also shows that the history of the Anglo-Saxon invasion and settlement is mythical. All the dates are calculated upon the sacred number 8. Thus the periods of 24, 16, 8 and especially 40 years, are met with at every turn.

In the *Traveller's Song* in *Beowulf* and other early Anglo-Saxon poems we find many personal names which have attached themselves to places. The *Herelingas* or *Harlings*, left their name in *Harlingen*, *Friesland*; the *Swæfus* (*Angles*), at *Swaffham*; the *Brentings*, at *Brentingham*; the *Scyldings* and *Scylfings*, at *Skelding* and *Shilvington*; the *Ardings*, in *Ardingly*, *Ardington* and *Ardingworth*. These were the *Azdingi*, the royal race of *Visigoths* and *Vandals*; a name which confirms the tradition of a settlement of *Vandals* in England. (See *Zeuss*, pp. 73, 74 and 461.) The *Heardingas* left their name to *Hardingham* in *Norfolk*; the *Bannings*, in *Banningham*; the *Helsingas*, in *Helsington* and *Helsingland* (*Sweden*), and so on with nearly a thousand others, which Kemble gives in an Appendix to his work. The

Tótingas, a Saxon tribe, left their name to Tótinga-ham, in the county of Boulogne, and to Tooting, in Surrey. Kemble, i, 10.

The Persians (of the Roman period) called the Scythians, Saces; the ancients called them Araméens. The Massagetæ, the Histi (Iesti), the Essedones, the Arimaspes, and others, were all Scythians and of one race. They traded with the Orient by way of the Oxus, Caspian and Euxine. Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, xix, 1.

The use of coined money was well known to the Phœnicians, the Greeks, and the Carthaginians; and had these nations found none in Britain they would scarcely have failed to communicate so useful an invention to a country with which they held such valuable and long continued intercourse. The Phœnicians had bronze and brass to sell; the Greeks, silver; and the Carthaginians, gold; and these nations would not have omitted to enhance the value of their respective staple commodities by indicating the various uses to which they might be put. Among these was money.

The Gauls were of the same race, and spoke the same language as some of the southern Britons. The former used coined money several centuries before our æra. The art of making and using it must therefore have been known to their insular brethren. Thus there were two species of money current in Britain before the Roman period, the baugs of the Norsemen and the coins of the Gæls. Both of them are mentioned by Cæsar and numerous specimens of both species are preserved in our cabinets. Nothing so strikingly marks the difference between the Goths and the Teutons and Gæls as these mute but eloquent memorials of the past. The Norsemen used baugs; the Gæls and Teutons used coins.

APPENDIX B.

THE CODEX ARGENTEUS.

“**U**LFILAS, bishop of the Goths,” is mentioned in the ecclesiastical histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret.¹ “Bishop” was the common name applied at that time to any ecclesiastical leader, christian or pagan. For example, the worshippers of Serapis had

¹ Socrates, ii, 41; Sozomen, vi, 37; Theodoret, iv, 37. Ulfilas is also mentioned in the epitome of Philostorgius, prepared by Photius the Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 853. Photius calls him Urfilas, the son of a Cappadocian prisoner to the Goths, and an Arian. He places him in the reign of Constantine I., and says that he “translated” both the Old and the New Testaments, but does not say from or into what language.

bishops. The assertion that there was an "Ulfilas, bishop of the Goths," does not prove him a christian. Sozomen goes farther than this, he says that during the reign of Valens, the Huns of the Caspian drove the Goths of Mœsia into the Roman territory of Thrace, when the latter sent an agent (A. D. 378), to Valens, asking permission for them to remain where they were, a request to which the emperor graciously assented. As the "Goths of Mœsia" had occupied that province and the adjoining one of Thracia for upwards of seven hundred years, this part of the narrative is evidently perverted. "Ulfilas, the bishop of the nation, was the chief of the embassy." Sozomen goes on to say that Ulfilas had previously (A. D. 359) attended the council of Arian christian bishops at Constantinople, "with Eudoxius and Acacius." As Acacius was in fact not made bishop till many years later, this part of the narrative is also wrong. Sozomen continues that Ulfilas, in pursuance of his mission (of 378) repaired to Constantinople and "entered into disputations on doctrinal topics with the chiefs of the Arian faction, and they promised to lay his requests (presumably about a residence for the Goths), before the emperor, and to forward the objects of his embassy, if he would conform to their views." What these views were, we are not informed. Whether this account is true or false, it does not as yet assert that Ulfilas was a christian. However, what comes next is more to the point: "Ulfilas exposed himself to innumerable perils in defence of the faith during the period that the aforesaid barbarians were abandoned to paganism. He taught them the use of letters and translated the Sacred scriptures into their own language." What faith: the Dionysian? What letters: the Runic, the Greek, or the Latin? What Sacred scriptures: the Sibylline books, the Theogony of Hesiod, the Æneid of Virgil, the legends of Ies Chrishna, or the gospels of Christ?

These questions were attempted to be answered by the monks of the seventeenth century, who claimed to have discovered in the monastery of Werden, county of Mark, in Westphalia, (near Cologne,) a mutilated version of the gospels, in corrupt Gothic, the letters of which were formed of silver (hence its name, the *Codex Argenteus*), and the initials of gold. The work thus providentially discovered was recognized by them as the translation of "Eufilas," bishop of the Goths, in the fourth century. It was pretended by John Geo. Wachter, on behalf of the alleged discoverers, that the ms. had probably been captured either by Clovis from Alaric II. at Toulouse, in 507, or by Childebert from Amalaric, in 531, and, by one of these monarchs, deposited in the abbey of Werden; but no proofs worthy of a

moment's consideration were offered in support of these strange pretensions.²

Before pursuing the narrative of this holy relic it will be as well to examine the credentials of the earliest witness, upon whose testimony its pretended authorship rests. These credentials are drawn not from his enemies but his friends, those whom both inclination and interest prompted to give to the world the most favourable account of his work. Says his translator, Mr. Edward Halford, M. A., late scholar of Balliol College, Oxford: "The ecclesiastical History of Sozomen seems to have been commenced about the year 443. It is generally admitted to have suffered many alterations and mutilations, and this may in some measure serve to account for the frequent inaccuracies in point both of narrative and of chronology, which pervade the nine books of which it is composed. It is evident from the very abrupt termination of this history that it is but a fragmentary portion of a larger work."³ So much for the testimony of Sozomen: it has been altered and mutilated; it is inaccurate; it is fragmentary. Is it worth while to consider it any farther?

Upon its "discovery" at Werden the Codex Argenteus was taken to Prague, where, at a later period, it was captured by the forces under Gustavus Adolphus and sent to Stockholm. After lying for some time in the library of Queen Christina, it suddenly disappeared, and is said to have turned up again in Holland during the year 1665. But there is no certainty that what turned up was the original. In 1669 it was purchased by Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie for 600 thalers, and presented to the University of Upsal, where it remained until 1702, when it was lost by fire. However, before this occurred, it was copied and published, so that we have, what is said to be, a correct copy of it at the present time. Of the truth of this statement the reader may be able to judge for himself as we proceed. The title of the first edition appears in the Bibliography prefixed to the present volume. The second edition was published in 1671, at Stockholm, and many editions have since appeared.

Like all the literary evidences touching religion, which have been preserved or prepared for the edification of posterity, this one has evidently passed through the hands of the Sacred College of Rome and has been subjected to the studied revision of the subtlest agents whose services that institution could command. Therefore the proofs of its perversion (if it be perverted) must not be expected to lie upon the surface. Briefly recounted, they are as follows:

² Wachter, lib., III, c. 10.

³ Preface to 8vo. ed. 1855, p. 6.

I.—The Codex Argenteus has neither date nor signature; always grounds of grave suspicion in relation to any document.

II.—The margin of the burnt vellum contained various readings, a proof that this copy was prepared at a later period than that assigned to Ulfilas.

III.—A portion of the Codex, as at present printed, was taken in 1763 from some scattered leaves of vellum which it is alleged once formed part of the gospels with a "Gothic" translation, of the ninth century, found in the library of Wolfenbüttel, duchy of Brunswick. This is called the Carolinus.

IV.—Both the original story, the circumstances attending the discovery of the vellum, and the internal marks, betray for this copy a mediæval, German, monastic, paternity. Ulfilas is neither a Gothic nor a Cappadocian name. Both the Codex Argenteus and the Codex Carolinus were found in a part of Germany, where there had been no Goths since the days of Charles Martel. No other manuscript exists containing similar letters, many of which are a mixture of Greek and Latin, the same as were employed in Italy during the mediæval ages.⁴

V.—The runic alphabet contained sixteen letters; that of the Codex contains twenty-five and they are very unlike runes.⁵ Upon closer examination, the letters of the Codex (which were all capitals) appeared "not to have been written with a pen, but stamped or printed on the vellum, with hot metal types, in the same manner as the book-binders at present letter the backs of books." Except that in the case of the Codex each letter was "stamped separately" we have here the invention of printing with moveable types. This may be an Indian invention brought by the Goths from the East, but it was certainly unknown in the West.⁶ From the outset of their intercourse with the Goths the Roman monks opposed the use of runic letters "as tending to retain the people in their ancient superstitions."⁷ In connection with the present subject this policy assumes a profound significance. The language of the Codex is more German than Gothic, approaching nearest to the present dialect of Thuringen. The grammar of the language of the Codex Argenteus is German, which has an article, whilst the Gothic denotes the article by the termination. The infinitives are frequently formed by prefixing *ga*, as *galaikan*, *gatairan*, etc., like the Thuringian idiom, in *gervicha*, *gervichen*, etc. The Suabian monk, Otfrid, wrote a variety of works, among them what is called

⁴ As proved by an Arrezzan conveyance in the *Inscriptiones Antiquæ* of J. Baptista Domius, Florence, 1731, p. 496.

⁵ Mallet, 225-32. ⁶ Mallet, 225; Dom. Johan Ihre, etc.

⁷ Mallet, 228.

a paraphrase of the gospels in Allemanian rhyme, about A.D. 876, and he opened a school of literature in the abbey of Weissenburg, in Alsace, where this copy of the Codex Argenteus is as likely to have been prepared as in a Gothic settlement on the banks of the Danube. The ninth century also produced the Ludwigslied, which celebrates a victory over the Goths, and suggests the preparation of just such a work as the Codex Argenteus, with which to convert the newly conquered heathen. In a treatise on the Ceremonies of the Byzantine Court, written by the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, during the tenth century, are two catalogues of Gothic words used at the same time in Mœsia and Thracia; yet none of them bear any resemblance to the language of the Codex Argenteus, which, therefore, concludes Mosheim, is not Gothic. If not Gothic, he leaves it to be inferred that it is a forgery. In coming to this conclusion the eminent commentator saw no middle ground between accepting the Codex as a Gothic translation of the Greek gospels and an imposture. But suppose that instead of an imposture it was merely a perversion; suppose that instead of being a translation of the Greek gospels it was really the original text from which our (Greek) gospels themselves were translated and altered; what then?

APPENDIX C.

ROMAN WALLS IN BRITAIN.

YEAR A.D.	BUILT BY.	ROUTE.	CALLED.
78	Agricola,	Tyne to Solway,	Inner.
80	Agricola,	Forth to Clyde,	Outer,
120	Hadrian,	Tyne to Solway,	Inner,
140	Antoninus,	Forth to Clyde,	Outer,
210	Sept. Severus,	Tyne to Solway,	Inner.

The Outer Wall—which was originally built by Agricola and afterwards repaired, enlarged, and strengthened by Lollius Urbicus, during the reign of the emperor Antoninus Pius—was also called the Vallum Antonini and, in modern days, Graham's Dyke. The Inner Wall—built by Agricola, and enlarged and strengthened by Hadrian—was called the Vallum Hadriani.

INDEX.

Aarlesden, amt Fyen, 170.
 Accounts, publication of, 103.
 Æra, 85.
 Æsclepiadus, 24, 51.
 Agricola, pro-consul in Brit., 34, 37.
 Aix-la-Chapelle, city, 137, 147.
 Alaric, 65, 82, 134.
 Albans, St., (*see* Camulodunum.)
 Albigenes, 105, 146.
 Albion, 12.
 Albinus, usurper, 42.
 Aldermen, 157.
 Alemanni, 56, 57, 141, 156*n*.
 Alfonso el Sabio, 86.
 Alfred the Gt., 86, 91, 143, 179, 182.
 Allectus, 50.
 Amalfi, 86, 88.
 Amber, 3, 130.
 America, 25, 142, 146.
 Anderida, city, 67, 69.
 Angles, a Gothic tribe, 53, 135, 138.
 Anglo-Saxon invasion, 55, 190.
 Antiquarian discoveries, 10.
 Antoninus, Wall of, 19*n*.
 Apollonia, 48.
 Appius Claudius, 102.
 Arabians, 75, 146.
 Arcadius, sov.-pont., 65.
 Arians, 57, 140.
 Aristotle, 2, 105.
 Arles, 46, 82.
 Arnoul, bishop of Metz, 146.
 Art, decadence of, 29, 164.
 Assemblage, right of, 14.
 Assessors, 111.
 Astronomy, 24.
 Athelstan, 161, 184*n*.
 Attila, the Hun, 67, 143.
 Augusti, 49, 59.
 Augustine, St., 53, 60, 133.
 Augustini, or Augustines, 132.
 Augustus, sov.-pont., 21, 23, 27, 29, 69, 79, 82*n*., 83, 86*n*., 94*n*., 106, 111, 177.
 Aulus Plautius, 34.
 Aurea Legenda, 92.
 Avars (*see* Huns.)
 Aventine, Mt., 99.
 Bacchus, 55*n*., 56, 60, 74, 101, 113.
 Bagaudæ, 50.
 Baikal lake, 4, 5.

Bangles (*see* Baugs).
 Banks, Bankers, Roman, 23.
 Barbarian Invasions, 55, 66, 69, 126.
 Bardewick, 147, 151.
 Barter, 120.
 Bath, city, 35.
 Baugs, 10, 168.
 Bede, 10, 71, 137, 181, 194.
 Beer, 21.
 Benefices, 18, 63, 184.
 Bergen, Roman voyages to, 25.
 Bishops, pagan, 23, 195.
 Blodorns, 169.
 Boadicea, queen, 29, 34, 35, 48.
 Bombacine, a textile fabric, 21.
 Booksellers, 104.
 Boulogne (Iesoriacum) 19, 21, 24.
 Bowline, sailing on a, 24.
 Brahma, Brahminism, 28, 32, 94.
 Bretagne in France, 2.
 Bretwealdas of the Heptarchy, 175, 188.
 Breweries, 21.
 Bridges, 19.
 Britain, origin of the name, 1.
 ———, circumnavigation of, 38.
 ———, discovery of, 3.
 ———, history of, 17.
 ———, introduction of Christianity, q. v.
 ———, conquest by Hengist & Horsa, q. v.
 Britons, extinction of the Gælic, 38, 39.
 Brittany, in France, 2.
 Brittia, or Jutland, 2, 8.
 Brittones, 2, 3.
 Bronze Money, 21, 22, 23, 118, 123.
 Brunansburg, battle, 162.
 Buddha, Buddhism, 5, 13, 28, 32, 56*n*., 74, 91, 101, 113, 129, 158, 187.
 Burgundy, 67.
 Byzantium, 153.
 Cadastre, 157.
 Caius Flavius, curule ædile, 27*n*.
 Caledonia, Caledonians, 38, 40.
 Calendar, 27*n*., 85.
 Camulodunum, 36.
 Candles, in Roman mines, 21.
 Canon law, 27*n*., 87, 101.
 Cantyre, straits of, 11.
 Caracalla, sov.-pont., 45.
 Carausius, emp., 50, 72, 178.
 Carthage, Carthaginians, 2, 48.

- Cassians, school of jurisconsults, 80.
 Castles, 42.
 Census (*see also* Cadastre), 157.
 Ceylon, Roman voyages to, 25.
 Chagan, 147.
 Chalk merchants, 23.
 Chalybia, 128.
 Charlemagne, 32, 86, 136, 143, 146, 147, 149, 151, 152, 167, 183, 186, 187, 190.
 Charles Martel, q. v.
 Chickens, Sacred, 101, 103.
 Christian monogram, 31.
 Christianity, 30, 31, 51, 59, 63, 84, 85, 147.
 ———, evolution of, 33*n.*, 57, 77, 147.
 ———, its characteristics, 32, 78, 147.
 Christmas, 146.
 Christnalas, 157*n.*
 Cimbria, Cimbrians, 140.
 Cirencester, 68.
 Civil law, 78, 101.
 Claudius, sov.-pont., 1, 12, 34, 35, 72, 190.
 Cloth money (*see* Vadmal).
 Clovis, k. Franks, 85, 145.
 Coal mines, Roman, 18*n.*
 Cockney dialect, 7.
 Codes of Law, 81.
 Codex Argenteus, 155, 159*n.*, 196.
 Cogidanus, 17, 35.
 Coins, bronze, q. v.
 ———, iron, silver-plated, 42.
 ———, historical, 104, 180, 185.
 ———, Moslem, 153.
 ———, gold, 185.
 Colchester, city, 36.
 Colonial policy, Roman, 22.
 Comitia, Roman, 27, 78.
 Commerce, foreign, 21.
 Commodus, sov.-pont., 42, 43.
 Common law, 88.
 Commons, House of, 89, 94, 101, 106, 114.
 Constantine I., sov.-pont., 51.
 Constantinople, 52, 185.
 ———, Fall of, 23, 92, 93, 187.
 Copper coins, mines, minting, 18, 20.
 Corn trade, 22.
 Cortes, 92*n.*
 Coster, or wild apple, 17.
 Councils, 90.
 Cramond (Alaterva), 19.
 Crimes against Mankind, 118.
 Cross, symbol of the, 5, 31, 32, 33*n.*
 Curia Regis, 92, 111.
 Dagobert, k. Merovingian Franks, 81.
 Dale, 7.
 Danegeld, 44.
 Decadence of Rome, 30.
 Decemviri, the, 100.
 Dicasts (*see* Jury).
 Diocletian, sov.-pont., 46, 49.
 Dionysius Exiguus, 85.
 Doctors, Romano-British, 24.
 Drainage of farm lands, 20.
 Druids, Druidism, 8, 9, 38, 54, 145, 171*n.*, 184*n.*
 Duke, a title of nobility, 185.
 Dykes, 17, 20.
 Earth (*see* Sphericity).
 Ecclesiastical law (*see* Canon)
 Edward, Elder, 175.
 ——— III., k. England, 93.
 Egyptian chronology, 168.
 Elagabalus, sov.-pont., 5.
 Ella, k. Sussex, 134, 176.
 Emperor-worship, 13, 25, 27, 29, 31, 40*n.*, 43, 50, 55, 59, 69, 77, 106.
 England (*see* Britain).
 Epictetus, 123.
 Ethelbert, 85, 145.
 Eugenius, sov.-pont., 63.
 Evolution, religious, 33, 77.
 Exposure of children, 158.
 Feuds, feudalism, feudal system, 9, 17, 18, 28.
 Fine arts, 23.
 Fiord, 17.
 Fish-money, 168.
 Fisheries, 19, 162.
 Fleets, naval, 19, 143.
 Forgeries, 10, 73, 86*n.*, 87, 104, 155, 187, 189, 197.
 Frakki (*see* Franks).
 Franks, 14, 47, 140, 147.
 Frauds (*see* Statute).
 Frederick Barbarosa, 152.
 Frica, Mother of God, 139, 159*n.*
 Frisia, Frisians, 1, 2.
 Fylkis, Gothic communes, 155.
 Gaels, 8, 195.
 Gætæ, or Getæ, 6, 47.
 Gaius, Institutes, 82, 84.
 Gan-Esa, Hindu messiah, 6.
 Gardariki, Gothic province, 132, 152.
 Gentes coins, 123.
 Germania of Tacitus, 11, 135, 142.
 Germans, Germany (*see* Alemanni) 130, 135, 139, 141, 143, 147.
 Germanicus, Roman title, 11.
 Getæ (*see* Goths).
 Gildas, 71, 137.
 Glass, 18, 20, 22.
 Godfrey, 137.
 Gold, 18, 20, 22, 23, 118, 185.
 Gospels, suggested originals of the, 198.
 Gotama, 129.
 Gothic Uprisings, 3, 13, 17, 52, 58, 60, 75, 133, 174.
 Goths, 10, 13, 45, 52, 126, 135, 139, 140, 143, 153, 154, 166.
 Government, Roman, 26, 28.

- Government, Gothic, 154.
 - Graham's Dyke, 15.
 Grape vines (*see* Wines).
 Gratian, sov.-pont., 57, 190.
 ———, ecclesiastic, 87.
 Greek literature, 104*n*.
 Gregory I., pope, 32, 70, 86*n*.
 ——— VI., pope, 87*n*.
 Guelfs and Ghibellines, 137.
 Gunnarsbaug ship find, 165.
- Habeas Corpus, writ, 117.
 Hadrian, sov.-pont., 19, 25, 39.
 Halcyon Ages, 106, 123.
 Halgaland, 131, 139.
 Han, Hansa, Hanseatic, 149*n*., 186.
 Hardouin, Father, 187.
 Hengist and Horsa, 2, 53, 64, 71, 143, 187, 194.
 Henry Lion, duke of Saxony, 148, 149, 152.
 Heptarchy, 43.
 Herads, Gothic communes, 155.
 Herod, 35.
 Hertha (*see* Frica).
 Hesta-things (*see* Horse).
 Hesus, 56, 56*n*., 145.
 Hidalgo, 144*n*.
 Hierarchies, 13, 16, 114, 115, 156, 183, 188.
 Highways in Britain, 19, 37, 51.
 Hincmar, bishop, 86.
 Hirsars, a Gothic class, 157.
 History, the dignity of, 16, 138, 180, 187, 191.
 Honorius, sov.-pont., 65.
 Horse feasts, sacrifices, etc., 158, 163.
 Horse tribes of the Sacæ, 128.
 Human sacrifices, 6, 131, 160.
 Huns; Hungary, 5*n*., 67, 75, 147, 149, 195.
 Husthings, 155.
 Hyksos, 168.
 Hypocausts, 20.
- Iceland, 5, 190.
 Ies; Iesaca; sun-god, 129, 131.
 Iesini, 12, 29, 34, 35.
 Iesnu, or Vishnu, Hindu messiah, 33*n*., 160*n*.
 Image-worship, 25, 29.
 Ina, k. Wessex, 40*n*.
 Indo-Germanic theory, 154.
 Industrial classes, Rom.-Brit., 22.
 Ingevones, 135, 154.
 Inquisition, 81.
 Insurance, marine, 37.
 Ireland, 39, 72.
 Iron, 18, 20.
 Iron-clad ships, 162.
 Ivan Vidfami, 67, 133, 152.
- Japan; Japanese, 172.
 Jasius, 4.
- Jesuits, 106.
 Jesus Christ, 71, 120.
 Jetland islands, 10*n*., 11.
 Jews, 29, 32, 148.
 John, k. England, 93.
 Jovinus, revolt in Gaul, 56, 67.
 Julian, sov.-pont., 22, 56.
 Julin, city, 150.
 Julius Cæsar, 9, 12, 27, 72, 79, 82*n*., 83, 104, 107, 111, 139, 170, 177, 180.
 Jurisprudence (*see* Codes and Law).
 Juridical system, Roman, 23.
 Jury, trial by, 14, 81, 98, 108.
 Justinian, sov.-pont., 82.
 Jutes, 141.
- Kangie, refuse heaps of, 18.
 Kinchester, 68.
 King (*see* Kung).
 Kingiktorsoak, monument, 25*n*.
 Kung, or Knung, 156.
- Labeo, jurisconsult, 87.
 Land Tenures, 28, 60.
 Language, Roman, Gothic, etc., 26, 26*n*., 159.
 Law, laws, 23, 26, 80, 87.
 Lawyers, Law school, 24, 80, 81, 86, 87.
 Lead, Romano-British pigs of, 36.
 Legal-tender, 123.
 Legatus Augustus, 18, 24.
 Legislatures, 93, 104, 106.
 Lex Romana, 82.
 Liber Pater (*see* Bacchus).
 Liberty, 78, 80, 83, 92, 106, 108, 112, 114, 118, 123, 127, 134, 164, 188.
 Light-houses, 19.
 Lincoln, city, 68.
 Literature, 104, 105, 186.
 London, 5, 8, 8*n*., 38, 41, 48, 51, 67.
 London, Sack of, 34; Stone, 51.
 Lothaire I., emperor of Germany, 147.
 Lothaire II., ———, 152.
 Louis IX., Saint, k. Fr., 107.
 Lubeck, city, 151.
 Lunden, Gothic city, 5, 90*n*., 146*n*.
 Luneburg, or Linonia, city, 147, 151.
- Machine shops, Roman, 20.
 Mæatæ, Gothic tribe, 41, 45.
 Magna Charta, 92*n*., 114.
 Mahomet, Mahometanism, 32, 86, 146.
 Maia, Mother of God, 29, 90*n*.
 Manillas; ring money of Africa, 169.
 Manufactures, Roman, in Britain, 20.
 Marculfus, forms of, 86.
 Marcus Aurelius, sov.-pont., 40*n*., 41.
 Maritime traits of the Goths, q. v.
 Marseilles, city, 21.
 Martel, Charles, 146.
 Matrem Deorum (*see* Mother of gods).

- Maximian Hercules, 40, 133.
 Maximus, emp., 54, 56, 61, 63, 68, 71, 72.
 Medical practitioners, 24.
 Menapia, Menapians, 2.
 Metonic cycle, 24.
 Milestones (milliaria), 19, 51.
 Military service, 18, 184.
 Mines, Mining, 18, 21, 30, 36, 37, 39, 122.
 Mints, 22.
 Mistletoe, 146.
 Mithra, Mithraism, 31.
 Money, prerogative of, 116; use of, 195.
 Monetary Commission, Roman, 23.
 ——— systems, 22*n.*, 84, 101, 117, 164, 167, 172, 178, 183, 188.
 Montezuma, 35.
 Moors, 57.
 Moral character of the Romans, 30.
 Moslems, 32, 105, 148, 167, 190.
 Mother of the gods, 2, 3, 6, 8, 29, 55*n.*, 60*n.*, 90*n.*, 101, 131, 139.
 Mowing machines, Roman, 18.
 Mozambique, Roman voyages to, 25.
 Müller, Max, cited, 54.
 Mutilations of scriptures (*see* Forgeries).
 Mutiny of Roman troops, 34, 41.

 Names, Roman 30; Gothic 194; English 92. of slaves 31.
 Nautæ Parisiaci, 56*n.*
 Nautical terms, 24.
 Navies, 19, 49, 143, 185.
 Navigation, 24, 162.
 Navigation laws, 21.
 Nennius, monkish chronicler, 73, 137.
 Nero, sov.-pont., 35.
 Ness, or cape, 7.
 New Year, 6.
 Nicæa, council, 60.
 Nistheim, the Gothic hell, 160.
 Nizzuz, 145*n.*
 Nobility, 28, 90, 177, 185.
 Normans, 182, 191.
 Norsemen, 38, 40, 171, 190.
 Norse superstitions, 14, 163.
 North American colonies, 22.
 Northumbria, 41.
 Norway; Norwegians, 3, 4, 155.
 Notaries, public, 23.
 Notitia Imperii, 39.
 Notre Dame, 56.
 Novgorod, 133, 150, 152, 190.
 Nummular grammar, 178.
 Nummular system, 122.
 Nundine, or Ninth day, 6, 98, 139.
 Nydham bog find, 165.

 Odin (*see* Woden).
 Offa, k. Mercia, A. D. 755-96, 184.
 Orkney Islands, 39.
 Ossian, of Macpherson, a forgery, 167.

 Ovid, cited, 47, 129*n.*, 154.
 Oxford, city, university and See, 7, 197.
 Oxford, Statutory Provisions of, 93.
 Oyster fisheries of the Romans, 19, 21.

 Palimpsests, 76.
 Pannonia, 147.
 Papinian, Roman jurist, 23, 82.
 Paraguay missions, of the Jesuits, 106.
 Parliament (*see* Commons).
 Pavements, Roman tassellated, 21.
 Pelligrini, Father, 187.
 Pepin of Heristal, 146.
 Pepin le Bref, A.D. 714-68, 146.
 Perennius, 41.
 Pertinax, sov.-pont., 42.
 Peter's Pence, 40*n.*, 186*n.*, 188.
 Pevensey, destroyed Roman city, 67.
 Phœnicians, 1, 128.
 Physicians, Rom.-Brit., 24.
 Picts, 8, 10, 13, 41, 71, 72.
 Piracy, Gothic, 162.
 Place-names, 7, 131.
 Platina, Cardinal, 187.
 Pliny, on Monetary Crimes, 119.
 Police, Rom.-Brit., 19.
 Polypticum, 157*n.*
 Pompey, the Great, 139.
 Pontifex-Maximus, 101.
 Popes, 87*n.*, 148.
 Posts, and post-horses, Rom.-Brit., 19.
 Pow-wow, an Indian council, 91.
 Prasutagus, a British chieftain, 17, 34.
 Prerogative of Money, 116, 125, 185.
 Printing, alleged, 4th century, 198.
 Priscillian, 62*n.*
 Probus, sov.-pont., 47, 50, 133.
 Proconsuls in Britain, 37.
 Professions, learned, 23.
 Publicola, institutes of, 108-9.
 Pultowa, battle, 6.
 Puritans, 106.
 Pytheas of Marseilles, 2, 11, 130, 155.

 Quintius Fabius Rullianus, Max., 102.

 Rada-Gaisus, 4, 65.
 Ratio of silver to gold, 172*n.*, 173, 178.
 Receipts (*see* Revenues).
 Religion, Roman, 26, 28, 188.
 ——— Gothic, 154.
 Representation in the Commons, 14.
 Retts, or indemnities, 157.
 Revenue and Expenditure accounts, 103.
 Risars and Half-Risars, 154.
 Roads (*see* Highways).
 Roland, the song of, 184.
 Roman history of Britain, 16.
 ——— occupation of Britain, 15.
 ——— language and religion, 75.
 ——— law, 75, 76, 88.

Rome, sacked by Alaric, 134.
 ——— Scat, 40*n.*, 57, 168.
 Romulus, his alleged Senate, 95.
 Rugen, isle, 149.
 Runes; runic inscriptions, 4, 5, 25*n.*, 131, 141, 166*n.*, 167, 172, 196, 198.
 Russia, Russians, 90.
 Sabinians, 80.
 Sacæ, 127, 194.
 Sagas, 166, 186.
 Saint Albans, 36.
 ——— Augustine, 72.
 ——— Jerome, 69.
 Saints, or minor deities, 28.
 Sancho IV., k. Aragon, 86.
 Sandefjord, ship-find, 194.
 Saxons; Saxony, 13, 14, 135, 138, 147, 153.
 Saxonius, surname of Theodosius, 53.
 Saxon Shore, Counts of the, 13, 193.
 Scandinavia, 130, 133.
 Scats, Gothic coins, 167.
 Scots; Scotland, 45.
 Scythia; Scythians, 8, 194.
 Selecti, Three Hundred, 107, 111.
 Seltz, Treaty of, 187.
 S. C. (Senatus Consulto) money. (*See* Bronze.)
 Septimius Severus, sov.-pont., 23, 43.
 Serapion; Serapis, 31, 33, 195.
 Servius Tullius regulates Rom. tribes, 100.
 Sibylline books, 95, 196.
 Silver, 18, 20, 23, 118, 123.
 Slaves, British, 31.
 ——— Gothic, 157.
 ——— Roman, 31, 70, 82, 84, 89.
 ——— Ecclesiastical, 60, 92.
 Slavs, or Slavs, 75, 139, 148, 153.
 Solon and popular rights, 113.
 Son of God (Divus Filius), 29, 177.
 Sozomen, ecclesiastical writer, 196.
 Speaker of the Commons, or Comitia, 97, 100.
 Specialization of Industries, 23.
 Sphericity of the Earth, 24.
 Statute of Frauds, Gothic, 157.
 Stilicho, Roman general, 66.
 Stundists, of Russia, 115*n.*
 Subsidence of the Sea, 19*n.*
 Suiones, 138, 143.
 Surnames (*see* Names).
 Suttee, Gothic, 163.
 Suzerainty of Rome, 189, 193.
 Svastica, 3, 131, 141, 172, 174.
 Syracuse, city, 48.
 Tacitus, sov.-pont., A.D. 275-6, 105*n.*
 Tam-Ies, Tam-Issus, or Thames, 5, 11, 20.
 Tat (Buddha), 56*n.*
 Tatars, or Tartars, 112, 136.
 Taxes, tributes and customs, 37, 39, 40*n.*

Tel-el-Amarna, ring money, 168.
 Teutones, 130, 139, 195.
 Teutonic monk-knights, 149.
 Teutonic theory, 11.
 Tammuz (*see* Tham-Ies, Buddha, etc.)
 Theodoric, Gothic k. Italy, 85.
 Theodosian Code (*see* also Codes), 27, 82.
 Theodosius Saxonius, 53, 57, 65, 71.
 Theodosius I., sov.-pont., 58, 59, 65.
 ——— II., ——— 27, 81.
 Things, or Gothic assemblies, 155.
 Thor, 52, 158.
 Thracia, Thracian Goths, 46, 47.
 Thralls (*see* slaves).
 Three Hundred (sacred numbers), 108, 110, 111, 112.
 Tiberius, sov.-pont., 23.
 Tiles, 8*n.*, 19.
 Timæus, on Monetary Crimes, 119.
 Tin, 8, 18.
 Titles (*see* Nobility).
 Tomb rifling, 162.
 Tombstones, Roman, 30.
 Totems, Gothic, 6.
 Toulouse, city, 82.
 Towns, British, 39.
 Trapesus (Trebizond), 128.
 Treves, city, 46, 51, 62.
 Tribes, British, 39.
 Tribonius, Roman jurist, 82.
 Tribute (*see* Rome-Scat, etc.), 57.
 Triune deities, 6.
 Truth, historical, 187.
 Twelve Tables, 83, 157.
 Ulfilus, "bishop of the Goths," 155, 195.
 Ulpius, proconsul in Britain, 42.
 Universities, 24, 86, 87, 114.
 Upheaval of the land, 19*n.*
 Upsala, city, 52, 147, 161.
 Vadmal, cloth money, 149, 161.
 Valentinian I., sov.-pont., 56, 57.
 ——— II., ——— 57, 60.
 Valhalla, 160.
 Valkyries, 160.
 Vandals, 140, 148, 150.
 Varangians, 13.
 Varro, Roman writer, 105*n.*
 Vassalage, 11, 18, 189.
 Vassals, 35, 189, 193.
 Velocity of Money, 121.
 Vendée, 8.
 Veneti, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 13, 128, 132, 139.
 ——— Baltic, 3, 8, 139, 149, 151.
 Venus de Milo, 98.
 Verulamium, city, 36.
 Vicarious government, 42, 51.
 Vikings, 11, 45, 49, 56, 139, 142, 144, 162.
 Villas, Rom.-Brit., 20.
 Vines, 17, 21.

- Vinet (*see* Veneti).
 Virius Lupus, Roman proconsul, 42.
 Vit, Dr. Vincenzo de, cited, 2, 23*n*.
 Volapuk language, 76.
- Waldemar I., k. Denmark, 150.
 Wales; Welsh, 39, 53.
 Walls, military, 15, 17, 19*n*., 37, 39, 40, 41
 42, 44, 45, 50, 57, 58, 61, 199.
 Walnuts (Gaul nuts), 17.
 Water-powers, 21.
 Watling street, 51.
 Wax images of ancestors, 28.
 Wessex, kingdom, 175.
 Weston, city, 68.
 Whale fishery, 19.
- Whitsuntide, 113.
 William I., k. England, 182.
 Wines, 21.
 Wisby, 142, 151.
 Witenagemote, 91, 106, 114, 125, 156*n*.
 Woden, 8, 32, 52, 74, 137, 146, 159, 163, 187.
 Wollin, isle, 130, 150.
 Women, rights of, in Gotland, 163.
 Woollen mills, Rom.-Brit., 21.
 Wroxeter, city, 36, 68.
- Yen-Iesi, river of Siberia, 4, 5.
 York (Eboracum), 19, 20, 34, 44, 68.
 Yoemen, Rom.-Brit., 44.
- Zachi, of Lake Baikal, 5.

 CORRIGENDA.

PAGE.	LINE.	
15	22	For <i>inabitants</i> read <i>inhabitants</i> .
30	41	For <i>Adams</i> read <i>Adam</i> .
37	40	After <i>Solway</i> add <i>and from the Clyde to the Firth of Forth</i> .
52	3	For <i>unmistakedly</i> read <i>unmistakingly</i> .
121	19	For <i>together</i> read <i>say</i> .
148	39	For <i>1109</i> read <i>1159</i> .
157	28	For <i>eunichs</i> read <i>eunuchs</i> .
157	33	For <i>relinguished</i> read <i>relinquished</i> .
168	35	For <i>Portugese</i> read <i>Portugurse</i> .
172	11	For <i>oro</i> read <i>ora</i> .
177	16	For <i>when</i> read <i>whom</i> .
177	33	For <i>Alexus</i> read <i>Alexius</i> .
188	2	For <i>when</i> read <i>whom</i> .

